THE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. XIII.—No. 21. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 TIM. III. 15. WHOLE NUMBER 645.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 29, 1843. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 109 NASSAU-ST. {TERMS—$3 00 PER ANNUM—IN ADVANCE.

THE TRIAL OF SIR JOHN OLDCASTLE,

Lord Cobham, before the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1 Henry the Vth, in the year **1413.**

On the Saturday after the Feast of St. Matthew, being the 23d day of September, as we held our Court in the Chapter House of St. Paul's, London, with our brethren, Richard, Lord Bishop of London, and Henry of Winchester, in Sessions with us; Sir Robert Morley, Knight, and Lieutenant of the Tower of London, appeared in Court with the said Sir John Oldcastle, Knight, and delivered him to us.

For he had been arrested a little before by the King's order, and confined to the Tower.

To the said Sir John Oldcastle thus personally appearing, we repeated in soft and moderate terms, and in a manner very courteous and obliging, all our proceedings against him, as they stand upon the journal of the former day; namely,

How he the said Sir John stood presented and charged by and upon certain articles exhibited in Convocation of the prelates and clergy of our said province.

And how he had been cited and excommunicated for his contumacy.

And though by his default it was come to this, we notwithstanding showed ourselves ready and willing to absolve him.

But he the said Sir John taking no notice of this our overture, answered, he would gladly make profession before us, and my said brethren, of the faith he believed and entertained.

For which we giving leave, as he desired, he drew out of his bosom an indented writing, and there openly read the contents of it, and afterwards, with his own hand, presented to us the said writing, touching the articles whereof he was accused; of which this is the copy:

"I, John Oldcastle, Knight, and Lord Cobham, desire it may be made known to all Christians; and I call God to witness, that I never have entertained, and by the help of God, never will entertain, any persuasion, which is not consistent with a firm and undoubting belief of all the sacraments which were ordained and appointed by Christ himself for the use of his Church.

"Moreover, that my faith, as to the four points alleged against me, might be more clearly understood, I declare,

"First of all, that I believe that in the adorable sacrament of the altar the very body of Christ does exist, under the species of bread: The same body, I mean, that was born of his mother Mary, that was crucified for us, that died and was buried, and rose again the third day from the dead, and was exalted to the right hand of his eternal Father, where he now sits partaker with him in his glory.

"Then for the sacrament of penance, I believe it is chiefly necessary for all that desire to be saved, to amend their wicked lives, and undergo such a penance for the sinful part of them, as by a true confession, an undissembled contrition, and lawful satisfaction, manifests itself to be agreeable to the holy Scriptures, without which none can hope for salvation.

"Thirdly, with respect to images: I hold that they are no ingredient in the Christian belief, but long after the publication of the faith of Christ, were introduced into the world, by the permission of the Church, to be a calendar to the laity and the ignorant, that by visible representations of the sufferings of Christ, and of the pious lives and martyrdoms of the saints, the remembrance of those things might the more easily be impressed on their minds: but if one so abuses the representation as to give that worship to these images of the saints, which is due to the saints themselves, or rather to him to whom the saints themselves owe all honor and adoration, and putteth his confidence in them, which is only to be placed in God; or is so affected towards these senseless images, as to be more devoted to them than God, in my opinion he is guilty of idolatry, and wickedly sins against God, the only object of his worship.

"Lastly, I am fully persuaded, that there is no abiding place upon earth, but that we are all pilgrims either on the way to happiness, or tending to misery: he that either knows not, or will not be instructed in, nor live in the practice of the commandments of God, it is in vain for him to expect salvation, though he went on pilgrimage into all quarters of the world. And on the other side, he that lives in obedience to the holy commandments of God, will undoubtedly be saved, though he never went a step on pilgrimage in his life, either to Rome, or Canterbury, or Compostell, or to any other places."

Sir John having thus read his writing, we with our brethren, the bishops above mentioned, and divers other doctors, and learned men, held a consultation about the contents of it: and by the advice and agreement of the same, we thus applied to the said Sir John Oldcastle at the same time and place.

Look you, Sir John, in this writing of yours it must be confessed, there are contained many good things and right Catholic; but this day was appointed you to answer to other points, which savor of error and heresy, which your declaration has not fully answered: and therefore you ought to explain yourself more clearly as to those points, and more particularly declare your faith and assertions expressed in the said writing, viz.,

Whether you hold, believe and affirm, that in the sacrament of the altar, after consecration by the priest, there remaineth material bread or not?

Also, whether you hold, believe, and affirm, that in the sacrament of penance it is necessary, where a priest can be had, to confess your sins to the priest, ordained by the Church?

To which state of the questions, amongst many other things said by the said Sir John, he answered expressly:

That he would not declare himself otherwise, nor return any other answer than in his said writing.

Upon this we replied to the said Sir John, with much patience, and in a courteous and affectionate manner: Sir John, it behooves you to consider well of this matter; because if you don't return a clear answer to the articles exhibited against you within the time assigned by the judge, we may proceed to pronounce and declare you an heretic.

But Sir John would abide by his former answer, and afford us no other.

We therefore advised with our brethren, the bishops above mentioned, and others of our council, and by their advice we declared to the said Sir John Oldcastle, what the holy Roman Church, following the doctrines of St. Austin, St. Jerome, and St. Ambrose, and other fathers in these, had determined, which determinations all Catholics were obliged to submit to.

To which the said Sir John gave for answer:

That he would readily assent to and observe the determinations and decisions of holy Church, and all that God required him to believe and observe; but that our Lord the Pope, the cardinals, the archbishops, and bishops, and other prelates of the Church, had power to determine such things, he would by no means affirm.

We still patiently bearing with him, in hopes he might be better informed by mature deliberation, promised the said Sir John, that certain determinations, relating to the points above mentioned, and to which he ought to give a clearer answer, should be translated from the Latin into English, that he might the more easily understand them, and they be published for his use.

And we commended and affectionately entreated him to prepare and deliver in a full and clear answer to the same, on Monday next following.

And we caused these determinations to be translated the same day, and to be delivered into his own hands the next Sunday, the tenor of which determinations is as follows:

The faith and determination of the holy Catholic Church, concerning the sacrament of the altar, is this: that after consecration by a priest at mass, the substance of the bread is changed into the material body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into the material blood of Christ; therefore, after consecration, there remaineth not any of the substance of bread and wine, which were in both before it.

What answer do you give to this article?

Also holy Church hath determined, that it is the duty of every Christian, living in the world, to confess his sins to a priest ordained by the Church, if he has the opportunity of such an one.

What are your sentiments of this article?

Christ ordained St. Peter to be his vicar on earth, whose See is the Church of Rome, and that all the successors of Peter, now called the Popes of Rome, should succeed in the same power and authority with which Christ invested him; by whose special power are constituted and ordained prelates in particular Churches; as archbishops, bishops, curates, and the rest of the ecclesiastical order, to which all Christians owe obedience, according to the traditions of the Roman Church.

This is the determination of holy Church; and what is your opinion of this article?

Besides these, the holy Church hath ordained, that it is the indispensable duty of every Christian man to go on pilgrimage to holy places, and there to adore the sacred relics of Apostles, martyrs and confessors, and of all the saints in the calendar of the Roman Church.

How do you hold this article?

On Monday the 25th of the said month of September, we assembled with our brethren, the bishops above mentioned; with the addition, by our order and command, of our venerable brother, Benedict, by the grace of God, Bishop of Bangor.

And our counsellors and officers; namely, Mr. Henry Ware, official of Canterbury; Philip Morgan, Doctor of both Laws; Howell Kiffin, John Kemp and William Carlton, Doctors of the canon law; and John Witnam, Thomas Palmer, Robert Wombervel, John Withead, Robert Chamberlain, Richard Doddington, and Thomas Walden, Doctors in Divinity; also, James Cole and John Stevens our notaries, both called to assist and take the examinations in the trial:

Were all and every of them sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, as they would answer it to God and the world, faithfully to discharge their duty that day, in the matter and cause above mentioned.

After this Sir Robert Morley, Knight, and Lieutenant of the Tower of London, brought Sir John Oldcastle into Court, and set him before us.

To whom we affably and courteously repeated the proceedings of the former day, and as before told him, how he had been, and still stood, excommunicated; and we entreated and besought him to desire and accept of absolution, in the usual form of the Church.

To which Sir John then answered in these words:

That he desired no absolution from them, but only from God.

Upon this we prayed the said Sir John, with an air of kindness and concern, to give his full answer to the articles exhibited against him.

But first, we demanded what he had to say about the sacrament of the Eucharist; to which article, among other things, he answered and said:

That as Christ, when he lived upon earth, had the divine and human nature united together in him; and the divine was veiled and covered under the human, and only the human visible and outward: so in the sacrament of the altar, there is the very body of Christ, and real bread too; the bread is the thing which we see with our eyes, and the body of Christ which is hidden under it, we do not see.

And the faith about this sacrament of the altar, expressed in the writing which we sent to him, as determined by the holy Roman Church, and the fathers, he expressly denied to be the determination of the Church; or if it was the determination of the Chnrch, he asserted such determination of the Church to be made contrary to the holy Scriptures, and after the Church was aggrandized and corrupted, and not before.

To the articles about penance and confession, he answered in these words:

That if any one is so entangled in the snares of sin, that he knows not how to extricate himself, it is advisable and expedient for him to apply to some pious and discreet minister for ghostly counsel; but that he should confess his sin to his own, or to any other priest, though he had never so good an opportunity, is not at all necessary to salvation; because such a sin can be forgiven only upon contrition, and on that alone can the sinner be cleared.

Concerning the adoration of the Holy Cross, he then declared and asserted, that the body of Christ, which hung upon the cross, ought only to be worshipped, because the body was and is the only adorable cross.

And being asked what honor he allowed to the image of the cross, he answered in these express words:

That to keep it clean, and in his closet, was the only honor he vouchsafed it.

As to the power of the keys, our Lord the Pope, archbishops, bishops, and other prelates, he said:

The Pope, and we together, made up the true Antichrist: the Pope was head, the archbishops, bishops, and other prelates, the body and limbs; and the friars, the tail of Antichrist; to which Pope, archbishops, and prelates, there was no obedience due, any farther than they imitated Christ, and Peter, in their lives, manners, and conversation; and that he is the successor of Peter, who follows him in the purity of his life and conversation, and no other.

The said Sir John added, addressing himself with a loud voice, and extended hands, to the people that were present:

Those who sit in judgment upon me, and are desirous to condemn me, will seduce you all, and themselves, and lead you to hell; take therefore good heed of them.

Upon his saying this, we applied to the said Sir John, and besought him, with tears in our eyes, and exhorted him in the most compassionate manner we could, to return to the unity of the Church. To which he returned this peremptory answer:

That he would not believe nor maintain otherwise than he had before declared.

Seeing, therefore, he was so hardened in his errors, that we had no hopes of working on him to renounce them, we proceeded with regret and bitterness of heart to pronounce the following definitive sentence:

"In the name of God, amen. We, Thomas, by divine permission, archbishop, and humble minister of the holy Church of Canterbury, primate of all England, and legate of the Apostolic See.

"Whereas, in our last Convocation of the clergy of our province of Canterbury, holden in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, London, after consultation upon several heretical tenets, and strict inquiry made who were the authors and abetters of the same, Sir John Oldcastle, Knight and Lord Cobham, was detected and presented of and for the said heresies, as having given great scandal throughout our province of Canterbury, by openly and avowedly professing the same. Upon the address and representation of all the clergy in the said Convocation for a process, we proceeded according to law against the said Sir John; and (as God knows) with all the equity and favor that could possibly be showed. And following the steps of Christ, who would not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live, we endeavored to reclaim the said Sir John, and tried all ways and means that we could devise to reduce him to the unity of the Church, declaring unto him the doctrines, tenets, and determinations of the holy Roman and universal Church, relating to those points.

"And though we found he had apostatized from the Catholic faith, and was so confirmed in his error, that he would not confess it, nor clear himself of it, nor disavow it; yet forbearing him in paternal love, and out of a sincere desire of his salvation, we allowed him a competent time for deliberation, and wherein he might repent, and reform himself.

"But forasmuch as we have experienced the said Sir John to be incorrigible and irreclaimable, we at last, with grief and heaviness of heart, in obedience to what the law requires, proceed to give sentence definitive against him.

"In the name of Christ, and having his honor only in view: forasmuch as we have found by divers acts done, produced and exhibited by indications, presumptions, and proofs, and many other kinds of evidence, that Sir John Oldcastle, Knight, is really and truly an heretic, and a follower of heretics, against the faith and religion of the holy Roman and Catholic Church; and particularly with respect to the sacraments of the Eucharist and penance; that as a child of darkness and iniquity, he had hardened his heart to that degree, that he refuses to hear the voice of his pastor, and will not be prevailed upon by gentle monitions, nor reduced by soft persuasions, though the merits of our cause, and the demerit of his own, he had diligently canvassed and weighed, and so aggravated the wickedness of his error by his damnable obstinacy:

"We, unwilling that he should contract further degrees of guilt, by the infecting others with the contagion of heresy, by the advice and consent of men famous for discretion and wisdom, our venerable brothers, the Lords Richard Bishop of London, Henry Bishop of Winchester, and Benedict Bishop of Bangor, and some other Doctors in Divinity, and of canon and civil law, and other religious and learned men, called to our assistance; we do peremptorily and definitively, by this present writing, judge, declare, and condemn the said Sir John Oldcastle, for an heretic, convicted of the detestable crime of heresy, and utterly refusing to be reconciled to the Church by repentance; and an apostate from those doctrines, in the above mentioned articles especially, which the holy Roman and Catholic Church holds, teaches, and hath determined; and we leave him from henceforth, as an heretic, to the secular judgment.

"And furthermore, we have excommunicated, and by these presents do denounce excommunicated the said heretic, and all others who shall hereafter, in favor of his error, countenance, defend, or afford him any counsel, aid or comfort; deeming such person or persons as abettors, encouragers and defenders of heretics.

"And that these premises might be promulged and known to all Christians, we charge and enjoin you, forasmuch as the said Sir John Oldcastle was and is condemned by us for an heretic, and schismatic, and as erroneous in the above mentioned articles; and also all other persons who, out of favor or affection to his error, shall hereafter countenance, defend, or afford him any counsel, aid or comfort, are excommunicated, as deemed abettors, encouragers, and patrons of heretics; according to our said definitive sentence, to give orders and directions to your priests and curates of your respective cities and dioceses, in their respective churches, when there is the greatest congregation of people, to declare, publish and expose, with loud and audible voice, and in our mother tongue, the said heretic and heretics, according to our said definitive sentence, and the order observed in this process; to the end that any wrong notions, which possibly the people may have given into, concerning these matters, and our proceedings upon them, might be rectified by this public declaration.

"Moreover, we will command you the bishops here present, to take copies hereof word for word, and send one to each bishop of our province of Canterbury; that so all and every of them may publish, intimate and declare, and cause, by their respective priests and curates, to be published in their several cities and dioceses, the manner and form of this our proceeding; and also the said sentence pronounced by us, and all and singular the contents of the same.

"And lastly, we require of you and them, that this business be despatched with all convenient expedition; and that you and they do duly and punctually advise and certify us of the time of receiving these presents, and how this our command has been executed by your and their letters patents, acording to the tenor hereof."

Given at our palace at Maidstone, on the tenth day of October in the year of our Lord 1413, and of our translation the 18th.

From the English Churchman, June 22.

Nothing can be more unfair than to quote the language of some two or three individuals belonging to a numerous body, and from thence to judge of the character of the whole. But when we see accounts of public meetings in every part of the country, at which similar language is used by different speakers, we may fairly conclude that we have data for forming an opinion of the class to which the several orators belong.

It is in this way that we have endeavored to exhibit the prominent and all-pervading characteristics of dissent, by quotations from the speeches at the numerous meetings held to oppose the educational clauses of the Factory Bill; those characteristics we have seen are falsehood, sedition, and irreverence; qualities which we should naturally expect from the bitter enemies of Christ's Holy Catholic Church.

Our task, on the present occasion, is a much more painful one, inasmuch as we are about to speak of a body which is only locally schismatical, and in its own legitimate sphere is an undoubted branch of the Catholic Church, although lamentably tainted with corruptions.

The proceedings of the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland have arrived at such a height as to make it a matter of unfaithfulness to overlook them, however painful it may be to draw aside the veil which Christian charity and brotherly love might wish to throw over them.

It is well known to most of our readers that, for several weeks, Mr. O'Connell has been making a tour through the principal places in Ireland, with a view to excite the people to demand the repeal of the union with this country. Had the addresses to the populace proceeded from the laity only, and had the language employed been that of soberness, decency, and truth, we should not have thought it our duty to comment upon the subject, although even then we should have felt that the proceeding was of a very questionable nature. But we have regretted to observe that the speakers have in many cases been priests of the Romish Church, and that the language has been intemperate, indecent, and false; thus showing that, by whatever class of persons schism may be persisted in, its invariable tendency is to degrade its victims morally and religiously.

It cannot be expected that we should disgrace our pages with quotations from the hundred speeches of Mr. O'Connell; we feel ashamed at having to introduce the term which is the only one which in a single word accurately characterizes them. We know no orator (which Mr. O'Connell undoubtedly is) in the present generation, who has been guilty of so much unmitigated *blackguardism*. Hunt, and Cobbett, and Dr. Wade, appear gentlemen compared with the Irish agitator. A man "born and bred" in a vulgar station may be excused if, in an excited moment, he betrays his origin, but Mr. O'Connell has not this excuse; he can speak and act as a refined Christian gentleman, but he voluntarily and deliberately degrades himself to the lowest and most disgusting language, in order to please those who are "to the manor born."

It is said by some writer (we think Mr. Inglis) that the present generation of Roman Catholic priests in Ireland are, generally, not gentlemen; and the writer accounts for their inferiority to those of the preceding generation (as near as we can recollect) in the following way:—

During the French Revolution numerous clerical and lay-refugees took up their residence in Ireland, and by their personal influence raised the standard of society wherever they dwelt. The clergy, either by self-denial, or by having other sources of income, were much less dependant upon their flocks. As these refugee priests sunk into the grave, their places were supplied by persons of a lower grade, and thus it has come to pass that priests have been made "of the lowest of the people," or of those who have felt it no degradation to be vulgar with the vulgar.

It is only on some such theory as this that we can account for the fact, that, however vulgar and foul the language which Mr. O'Connell may choose to employ in addressing the people; whether he call a peer of the realm a "filthy brute," or the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel a "a couple of villains;" whether he utters ribald jokes on the Lord's day, he never lacks a Romish priest to second and to sanction all he says and does. On some occasions he has even had the countenance of those who hold Romish authority to exercise the holy functions of a bishop. Indeed, with one or two very dubious exceptions, scarely amounting to Eli's "Nay, my sons, but it is no good report!" the whole of the Roman Catholic prelates have thrown in their lot with that of their priests.

Now, much as we may desire to show the errors of Romanism, we unhesitatingly state our belief that such proceedings as those now going on in Ireland are contrary to the priniples of the Romish Church. This is, indeed, evident by one fact which we select from many. At one of the repeal meetings, a priest, in detailing the hardships endured by the Roman Catholics, asks,—"Is it religious freedom, when I, in my native land,—in my native parish,—admitted by their own law to be a legally ordained clergyman,—recognised by that law as a pastor of the parish, cannot join in wedlock one of my young *Protestant auditors with any of my fair countrywomen?*"

We need not point out the absurdity of a priest of that Church which claims exclusively to be the "same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," complaining that he is not allowed to join a lamb of Christ's flock to one who is anathematized! What *must* Dr. Wiseman say to such things? Has Mr. O'Connell never heard of the question of "mixed marriages?" What discipline and unity can there be in a Church which cannot restrain such priests; we say *cannot*, for no one can believe that the enlightened Romanists do not see the *impolicy* and inconsistency of such doings. *We* know that Mr. O'Connell and the people are too strong for the priests, and that such is the wretched state of things in Ireland, that the priests must go with the stream or sink beneath it.

The charm of infallibility and unchangeableness is thus, day by day, broken by deeds. Why not acknowledge as much in words? This would at once repeal the only union which prevents Ireland from becoming

> Great, glorious, and free;
> First gem of the ocean, first isle of the sea.

It would repeal the union with popery, and thus give Ireland those "equal rights" which can be hers only when she receives from the same hands the Cup of Salvation, and with us calls upon the name of the Lord.

From the English Churchman of June 22.

NON-PRODUCTION OF SPECIFIC CHARGES AGAINST DR. PUSEY.

SIR,—In a leading article on the subject of the recent deplorable events at Oxford, the *Oxford Herald*, of June 16, asserts that "the general tenor and scope of a discourse may be clearly dissonant from the standards of the Church, without affording the opportunity of presenting distinct propositions which shall of themselves be palpably heretical."

It was, if I mistake not, by a precisely similar process of ratiocination, that the persecutors of Archbishop Laud convicted him of what might be called accumulative treason. "Not any one of his crimes," said Sergeant Wilde, "amount to a treason or a felony, but *all his misdemeanors put together do, by way of accumulation, make many grand treasons.*"

The reply of the Archbishop's advocate is worth the consideration of the Oxford Herald, —"I crave your mercy, good master Sergeant, but I never understood before this time, *that two hundred couple of black rabbits would make a black horse.*"

I am, &c. ANACHORETA.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

TO WHOM DOES THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY BELONG?

"Dr. Smith is rector of the Church to which the Seminary properly belongs."—Editorial from the Church Chronicle and Record, as quoted in the Churchman of the 15th inst.

Mr. Editor,—You have shown so much skill in exposing the false and slanderous charges contained in the editorial quoted above, that I am induced to ask you to explain what your brother of the Chronicle means, when he says that the Seminary properly belongs to the church of which Dr. Smith is rector. For surely he must mean something; albeit he may himself be as ignorant of what he does mean, as he professes himself to be of what he ought to believe.

Only two possible versions of the language quoted above, have occurred to my own mind; and I submit them to your better judgment. The one is, that Dr. Smith, in the view of the Chronicle, is a sort of *Rector Universalis* in regard to the American "Church to which the Seminary properly belongs;" by virtue of which office he would of course be bound and entitled to enter his protest, *coram Episcopo, clero, populoque, et omnibus aliis*, against all claims and pretensions of the "*Episcopus Universalis,*" whose throne is in the Roman St. Peter's, and against all supposed abettors and upholders of the same. The absence of all evidence in favor of the existence of such an office would render the suggestion of this interpretation quite absurd, did not the emphatic, and almost despairing, "we know not what to believe" of the editor, indicate that misty state of mind, in which small objects loom largely at a little distance, and which must needs expose its subject to any illusion of the fancy, however extravagant; not excepting the investiture of the reverend rector of St. Peter's, New York, with powers akin to those, which have been long since usurped and exercised by him of St. Peter's in Rome.

Besides, if this interpretation be absurd, because it has no foundation in fact, the other is equally so for the same reason; and is moreover contrary to known facts, as will appear in the sequel. So that it labors under the difficulty of twofold absurdity. And yet, I fear, that it is the more probable interpretation of this perplexing passage. For taking the context together with the text, the Chronicle seems to say literally that "the Seminary properly belongs" to the parish of St. Peter's; which, if it be not *vox, et praeterea, nihil*, like some of its other sayings, must mean that the Seminary is part of the said parish, an *imperium in imperio*, and that the rector of St. Peter's is therefore, in relation to it, a sort of *Summus Imperatur*, although the Bishop of New York is, *ex officio*, "President of the Faculty." If this view have any foundation in fact, it would be a charity to the rector of St. Peter's to make it known, since it might serve to illustrate his recently assumed, and apparently anomalous position of Supreme Inquisitor in regard to the Seminary in things pertaining to the faith; although it would present to view (if the Chronicle, together with the Rev. Hugh Smith, Doctor in Divinity, and the Rev. Henry Anthon, Doctor in Divinity, speak the truth,) the sad and shameful spectacle of a house divided against itself; of ungrateful and rebellious children turning a deaf ear to the tender accents of a loving father; of sons in the faith renouncing their fidelity to their lawful spiritual guardian, and going off at a tangent to Rome, notwithstanding the notorious Protest-antism of the reverend rector of St. Peter's! How painful, too, to see such throes in spiritual parturition thus issue in abortion! It calls up the laborious line of the Roman poet, "*parturiunt montes,*" &c. It is true that one, not thoroughly assured of the simplicity of the rector of St. Peter's, might be tempted, in consideration of his skill, learning, and ability, to seek some other way of accounting for the monstrous issue, that would not imply the utter defeat of such high qualities and such strenuous efforts. For instance, a parallel might be attempted between the great champion of Protestantism in our day, and those valorous upholders of Puritanism in the sixteenth century, who, under the auspices of Pius V., exchanged the Jesuit's garb for the robe of innocence, and bearding the lion in his den, (i. e., the bishop in his church,) bore vociferous witness against the Anglican followers of Antichrist, and summoned the orthodox *people* to stand forth as champions of the faith against bishops, priests, and deacons; piously acting on the Roman maxim, *divide et impera*. Such a parallel, I say, might be attempted; but, however plausible it might appear, I do and will maintain it to be false; for I am profoundly convinced, that the reverend rector of St. Peter's is not less certain of the real (I beg pardon for the word; I mean) *actual* presence of a living foe, not less honest and resolute in his purpose to overbear him, nor less valorous of heart to do battle to the death, than was the illustrious Don Quixote, when he dashed his rowels into Rosinante's side, and rushed forward to his encounter with the windmills.

Upon the whole, Mr. Editor, after viewing the various phases of this difficult passage, and withal summoning Charity, that best of interpreters, to my aid, I am forced to adopt the literal sense, that, (according to the Chronicle,) the Seminary, somehow or other, especially pertains, or is subject, to the parish of St. Peter's, and the rector thereof; although the assertion thus presented contradicts all my preconceived views of the character and relations of the Seminary. I had supposed that the General Convention of the Church meant something, when it gave the institution the name of "The General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States;" and that it belonged not to any parish or parishes in any case whatever, but to the dioceses collectively, which together compose the Church in the United States; and that, so far from being connected with any *parish* in particular, it has no connection with any *diocese* in particular, though topographically situated within the limits of the *state* (not *diocese*) of New York. And to this view its Constitution conforms; for all the bishops are thereby recognised as equally *ex officio* its Visitors, and members of the Board of Trustees; which also comprises delegates, in a fixed ratio of representation, from all the dioceses. Its Professors too are subject to the jurisdiction of different bishops.

The true solution and explanation of the case, no doubt, is this; that the Chronicle has judged "by appearances," in this as in other matters, and has inferred that the Seminary belongs to a particular parish or parishes, because the students are obliged by sad necessity to disperse on the LORD's day, as sheep without a shepherd, and to go from their proper spiritual home, in quest of spiritual food and communion. But surely this relation to the city parishes, (not to St. Peter's in particular,) is only accidental and temporary. The Trustees have plainly shown, that they regard the Seminary, not as a mere school for instruction in theological lore, but as a spiritual nursery for the complete training of candidates for holy orders, in all things necessary to constitute them fit and faithful pastors of CHRIST's flock. The daily services of the Church are celebrated through the week, notwithstanding the want of even a *decent* place of worship; giving earnest (it is presumed) of the future celebration, when that urgent want shall have been supplied, of all the holy services of the sanctuary, and of the edification unto holiness of the students of the Seminary, (as members of a religious household complete in itself, and connected with other congregations only by the all-comprehensive bond of love,) by the use every day, and chiefly on the LORD's day, of all the means of grace ordained and sanctified by Him, as instruments, whereby all the members of His body, the Church, are bound and held together, in vital union with their living Head.

When the Seminary shall thus be isolated, and detached from all connection with parishes and their rectors, (except in the official relation which the latter may sustain to it as Trustees,) and when it shall thus be perfected in its discipline, and fitted to develope in its students the whole character of the Catholic Churchman in its just proportions; there will be no reason to fear tendencies to Romanism, or any other form of sectarianism; while those busy-bodies, whose calling it is to collect and retail spiritual tittle-tattle, will lose the opportunity of indulging that generous propensity, and will have to seek elsewhere for the materials wherewith to construct their appeals to popular ignorance, prejudice, and passion.

I remain, Mr. Editor, respectfully yours,

CATHOLICUS, JUNIOR.

For the Churchman.

FREE CHURCHES.

It was asserted in a preceding communication, that numbers cannot, on account of poverty, obtain access to our churches. There are many baptized in our faith, and preferring it, whose attachment is not so much a matter of principle and conscience, but that easier accommodations will induce them to forsake it for some other; and it is believed that multitudes of this description may be found connecting themselves with the Methodist persuasion. A better provision for the poor would have retained them, and in the end made them better Churchmen. The rich among us build houses of worship, and the aim seems to be to gather as many of the wealthy in each as possible, while perhaps one or two pews near the door or in the gallery will be set apart for the poor, but occupied by none except pensioners upon communion alms. Those in moderate circumstances or just above the need of charity, will not sit there under the pauper's *badge*, but transfer their attachment, and in time their increased wealth, perhaps, to some sect where they can be received with less of humiliation.

Episcopalians, of all others, are bound to do away this reproach, because it rests upon us more than upon others.

"You can't get the people that go to free churches," said a Baptist minister, "for the poor do not go to the Episcopal Church."

"I should like," said a poor man once to me, "to go to the Episcopal Church, if my neighbors would not say that I was growing proud."

The impression prevails, that our churches are for the aristocratic and the wealthy: if with any justice, it is our greatest reproach, for the Gospel is for the poor, and no system can prosper that neglects the lower classes, who are well called the base of the pyramid of society. Travellers in England speak of the great increase in the attendance upon public worship in the Established Church, compared with former visits, and ascribe it to the increase of church-accommodation and free sittings. The same measures would give us popular favor, and of a kind most desirable. We are the more bound to use them, because we claim to be followers of the churches of antiquity; for if the customs of the apostolic age may be appealed to as law in other matters, why not in that of setting the house of God open to all, which certainly was the primitive mode? No worship is better adapted to the poor than our own, with its simple forms, intelligible to the meanest capacity, and its copious Scripture lessons, so suited to the wants of those who have little leisure during the week to read for themselves, or perhaps are unable to read. Why then shut out those for whom our service is best adapted, and send them to listen to metaphysical speculations, or a worship in which every thing takes precedence of God's own word? Let the prominent desire be to take care of the poor, knowing that the rich can take care of themselves, instead of reversing this rule; and we should lose in popular estimation, we should gain in spiritual influence; for nothing makes its way to the heart of the poor sooner than attention to their temporal

wants. And God, who careth for such as are in need, would give us his blessing.

But let us consider objections, and old prejudice will start many. It will be said, that the Free Church System looks well in theory, but fails in practice. It has not failed where fairly tried. Look at the Methodist Church, for we need not be ashamed to learn from Methodist or Papist, any thing good—and there are no better tacticians in advancing their peculiar interests in the field of rival sects than these. The Methodists have always adopted the Free Church System, and universally. No churches are better filled—no body of ministers better paid, their widows and children and the superannuated provided for; no denomination has so many missionaries prying into every nook and corner, nor is there any that stand higher among business men for prompt cash payments in their book concerns, while in number of communicants they yield to none. Their Articles of Religion are borrowed from our Prayer-book, together with many of their forms; their ministry is but a paste imitation of our own; their preaching no more scriptural than what may be heard in our pulpits, and their noisy excited worship not approved by one half of those who attend upon it; why then have they prospered? Because, for one reason, they have paid greater attention to the poor than any other people.—The meanest human being, who would give a wide birth to some of our splendid edifices, could enter a Methodist church freely, and perhaps be reclaimed to manliness and virtue. No one can look upon their Free Church System and say it has proved a failure, or doubt that they owe to it much of their prosperity. Will any Episcopalian say, "Let the poor go to the Methodists, it is the best place for them?—he knows not his own Church. W. H. L.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I want light. The proceedings of Drs. Anthon and Smith in relation to the ordination of Mr. Carey, are so contrary to what I had supposed were the received notions of propriety, that I am disposed to ask a few questions which will, I trust, draw from some competent source answers that will be both well-timed and instructive.

1. Is it right for clergymen when they differ from others of an equal grade, and especially when they differ from their bishop, to appeal to the *world* for justification? In my simplicity, I had thought that we were to shut out the world from influence in the affairs of the Church. I had been under the impression that our Saviour made her perfectly competent to manage her own business. I had supposed also, that when one of her members seemed disposed to turn from the decisions of her canonically constituted authorities, he betrayed a partiality for worldly wisdom utterly inconsistent with the simple faith in Christ and the obedience to his representative, which he unquestionably exacts.

I have likewise sometimes thought that such appeals indicated a consciousness that the cause maintained or the positions taken, are not so just and holy as they should be, and therefore it is best for the appellants to be tried before the less pure tribunal.

Am I wrong?

2. Is it usual for *private* examinations of candidates for orders to be divested of their distinctive character by *publishing* the details? Are the examining presbyters any thing more than a private council of advice to the bishop? And if so, do they not violate confidence in giving to the world their view of the words which were spoken or the things which were done while they were convened? What is the rule? If there be no written rule, what has been the practice? Is not the case analogous with that of action of the president's cabinet, his constitutional advisers? And do *gentlemen*, not to say *Christians*, justify any portion of the cabinet for publishing to the world the fact that they differ from their coadjutors and their superior, with a statement of their view of the private and delicately secret incidents and words upon which their difference was based?

3. When we *seem* to be very fair and candid, is it right to leave out of our statements material facts, or even facts which may not appear to us to be very material, but which we are conscious are differently regarded by others, and they the interested parties, even with the declaration that the statement of such facts is the business of others?

I pretend to nothing but common sense, sir, and perhaps the asking of these questions proves that I have no claim to that. Still I encounter the risk, and in spite of a hitherto high opinion of the two Doctors in Divinity, solicit the publication of this communication.

AMICUS.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—An expression in the "Statement of Facts," by the Rev. Drs. Smith and Anthon, has given rise to a difficulty in my mind, and I write to beg you to show me how I can be extricated.

The matter is this: I have a Greek Testament, in which Ephes. iv. 5 reads, εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα. This is translated in the English version, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." I have heretofore read it in this sense: that the ONE LORD, our blessed Master, Jesus Christ, delivered to the Church (*once for all*) ONE FAITH—briefly contained in the Creed, into which all were to be baptized with ONE BAPTISM. If this be so, the Faith into which Christians are baptized is now everywhere the same as it always has been in every place under heaven: i. e., every branch of the Catholic Church of Christ has continually baptized into this ONE FAITH, composed of *fundamental verities*, and utterly irrespective of, and disconnected from, the peculiar theological opinions which any one chanced to entertain on minor points. But the following extract from the pamphlet has brought me into a labyrinth of doubt and confusion:

"And *what Christian Churchman* will not, in view of the rapid changes effected by the last few years, be ready to exclaim, in deep anxiety, 'Whereunto will these things grow?' Our children have been by *baptism* brought within the Church's fold; but into what were we and they baptized? Was it not into the faith as it then was? Was it into a *changeling faith*, that shall go on changing and retrograding year by year, until it becomes identical once more with that system of darkness and delusion from which, not without conflict and blood, the Church came forth at the Reformation?"—Page 42.

I gather from this, that the faith into which the rectors of St. Mark's and St. Peter's parishes and their children were baptized, comprehends *as an* ESSENTIAL *part of it*, the opinions of "White and Hobart, and Ravenscroft and Bowen," p. 28, and Drs. Smith and Anthon, on "the differences between us and Rome"—"Apocrypha"—"Thirty-nine Articles"—"Transubstantiation"—"Purgatory"—"Council of Trent"—"state of the soul after death"—"denial of the cup"—"invocation of saints"—"Creed of Pius IV."—p. 27—otherwise there can be no point or force in the words "*changeling faith*," p. 42, for all the difference between the authors of the pamphlet and Mr. Carey—themselves being judges—respects these topics.

Am I mistaken in my view of the import of the sentences quoted? I think not, and am sorely puzzled to know what to believe on the subject. In the retired situation where I reside—"quæ a cultu atque humanitate civitatis longissimè abest"—there is but one other Churchman, and he is not theologian enough to remove my embarrassment. So, as it is of no use to apply to him, I am constrained to write to you, and beg you, or some of your learned correspondents, to explain the matter. Can it be possible that the old-fashioned view of the One Faith, which I mentioned above, has fallen into disrepute with the Episcopalians of the great city of New York? Perhaps the improvements in philology since I learned Greek, prove that εἷς. μια. ἓν, are equivalent to πολυς, πολλὴ, πολὺ. Or perchance some German neologist has discovered that I. Cor. i. 13. 15, should be read εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε, (*without* the interrogation point,) and that the two first words of the sentence, ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβάπτισα, are spurious, and should be cancelled. Peradventure it has been found that Christian Baptism is not the admission of individuals into the "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church," but merely a rite initiating them into the "fold" of certain *parts* of the Church—or even of the Protestant sects, by which they become entitled to the benefits, real or imaginary, of belonging to such societies. I knew a man who lived in New York, and this was his opinion: pray have you many more such "high Churchmen" in the commercial emporium of the western hemisphere?

Did not the expression which confuses me occur in a document carefully drawn up by two clergymen, I should be inclined to believe it one of the first principles of a new science, θεολογια νηπιων, for the edification of infants—four years of age.

But, Mr. Editor, I might go on conjecturing for a week, and not approximate the true meaning of this queer phrase, "changeling faith." Perhaps, after all, the printers made a mistake. Do let me know what *is* the real fact in the matter. If the private views which a few doctors entertain on subjects of which Scripture makes little or no mention, is "the faith" into which your New York clergy baptize, please define these accurately, that we may know what they are. Also, if the clergy who sympathize with Drs. Smith and Anthon, (if there be any such,) have different rituals for the administration of this rite, please send me a copy of each, that I may decide, as a free citizen of the United States, on their respective merits: and thus you will confer a lasting favor on your friend,

Ζητητής.

New Hampshire, July, 1843.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—It must be matter of joy to every really Christian-minded Churchman to see that the "Banner of the Cross," true to its standard—and the truest to the Cross are always truest to the Church—flinches not from making common cause with this diocese against the tumult and disorder which has been raised in its midst. It is not the first time that the Diocese of New York has found sympathy in sister dioceses, when insubordination and misrule have troubled it. That sympathy is peculiarly welcome from Pennsylvania, which found in our Hobart a good and true friend when *its* bishop met the memorable assaults which, some sixteen years ago, endeavored to establish therein the ungodly rule of faction and disorder.

J. L. D.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—When the conductors of our secular journals manifest a pious regard for the interests of religion and morality by urging their claims upon their readers in the ordinary course of editorial action; and when such as profess attachment to the Church manifest an habitual interest in its welfare; the friends of Christ and of the Church rejoice thereat, and bid them God speed in their holy work. But when it requires the discordant note of controversy to call them forth, and those whom devotion cannot warm are excited by polemics, a mournful spectacle is presented to the true Christian. He sees pearls cast before swine. Discrepancies which, kept within proper bounds, would but excite the faith and love of the true Catholic spirit to face them down to the standard of evangelical fidelity, are seized on by the god of this world to promote his unholy purpose of rending asunder the disciples of Him who was manifested that he might destroy his works.

Now, as at other times, when the household of faith has unhappily experienced the melancholy truth that the treasure of the Gospel is committed to earthen vessels, newspapers wholly given to mere worldly concerns are bringing in ecclesiastical matters by way of furnishing topics to which circumstances have given an interest religious on its surface, but profane and infidel in reality. Thus men on 'change, in shops, in every department of mammon's worship, and even in cliques and cabals of unholy severance from all that savors of the fear of God or honor of man, are invited to make unchristian pastime, and draw weapons of impious warfare, out of differences which the holy man would seek to keep from the world's gaze, and to heal by the influences of that Spirit which the world knoweth not.

In the unhappy disturbance of its godly quiet which clerical disorder has brought upon this diocese, the spirit which ruleth in the children of disobedience has seen too fair a field of operation to be neglected. *The Press*, that mighty engine of good and ill, has been excited to unwonted activity in nominal religious interest. Hardly a newspaper in this metropolis but has mingled with its business, its jests, its ribaldry, its pandering to worldliness and vice, its sore counteraction of the pure and holy spirit of the Gospel, some notice, meant to catch the many of the honest and unblenching purpose in which the Bishop of this Diocese has carried out the quiet decision and views of an enlightened majority against a minority's noisy and disorderly opposition.

Among those who thus strive to *make capital* out of the state of things which ungodliness and wrong have brought upon the diocese, unenviable prominence has been assumed by the editor of the "Morning Courier and New York Enquirer." He enacts herein the part of your real blusterer—a character, by the way, in which many good and true citizens will tell you he is quite at home. He fearlessly raises the standard and blows the trumpet of rebellion and revolution in this diocese, calling, in no uncertain terms, on its clergy and laity, to cut loose from its bishop, cast him off, and make another.

But for the iniquity which lies under all this, it might be matter for fair and honest merriment. The bishop and his friends may well smile at the malcontents for the champion whom they have secured in this well-practised experimentalist in carnal weapons. It would be well, however, for him, or for the *second* on whom he may devolve *the details of the affair*, to make himself better acquainted with the subject he handles than thus far he has proved himself to be. I fear he will find he must *marshal* greater intellectual forces than either he or his *friend* has yet evinced, before he can appear with any *honor* on the *field* which he has newly chosen. I think he will find that the good clergy and people of this diocese will not much tremble at the "guns, drums, blunderbusses, and thunder," which he would array against them; but quietly trusting in the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, will wait till this unrighteous warfare has passed over, and rejoicing in the King and Captain of their salvation, tarry His leisure till He brings to pass all His counsel against those who have ill will towards Zion.

M. E. R.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I can hardly consider so mild a term as *unfairness* equivalent to the introduction, as it has been introduced, of the name of our venerated Hobart, into the cause of our ecclesiastical agitators of the present day. Those who truly understood and cordially embraced his theological views, and enjoyed the aid to doing so of his *unqualified* esteem, and *unquestioning* confidence, know full well that his principles were precisely those which, since his day, have been developed in the general tenor of the Oxford Tracts, and the other leading publications of their distinguished authors. His opinion of the principles of the present Bishop of this Diocese—which I believe none will accuse him of having changed—is well known to many. None who truly knew him will doubt that an occurrence like that which signalized the late ordination at St. Stephen's would have met with a rebuke from him which neither the offenders, nor the age in which they live, would soon have forgotten.

And what would have been the feelings of that good man, could he have foreseen that the time-honored book establishment, in which the Bishop of the Diocese could always confide as true to the principles and order of the Church, and as the rallying point at which he could always find friends when opposition and discord lowered, would become tributary to opposition and discord, and a centre whence their ebullitions were to go forth to scatter firebrands in the Church? Men have a right to their own principles. They may oppose their bishops as they list. They may try as they will to bring discredit on the regular and orderly transactions of the Church. But they cannot expect, if thus they choose, to retain sound Churchman's confidence. 139 Broadway is no longer the true Churchman's home. Ought not the CHURCH DEPOSITORY, 20 John street, to be such?

N. Q. O.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, JULY 29, 1843.

THE ORDINATION OF MR. CAREY.

We said in our last, that Bishop Onderdonk would not want for assailants; and so the event has proved. The two doctors, to escape the indignation of the Church at their disorderly and contumacious conduct towards their bishop, have made an appeal to the public, and, by a one-sided statement of facts, have endeavored to turn upon their bishop the cloud which was ready to break upon their own heads.

Of course they have been partially successful. Let any two professional men, on a distinctively professional subject, appeal against their brethren to the passions and prejudices of the people, and they will gain an ephemeral applause for themselves, and bring a transient shadow of obloquy upon their profession. Nothing easier to be done, and nothing surer to be followed by disgrace to the recreants. We do not mean merely that such men will forfeit the respect and confidence of their brethren—that of course—but we mean that they will forfeit the respect and confidence of the people; for the people, though on professional subjects, especially if they pertain to theology, easily misled, are sure to come right in the end. They need only to have the truth fairly brought before them in order to come, surely how slowly soever, to a sound decision.

We agreed entirely with our brethren of the Committee that it was desirable, if possible, to spare Drs. Anthon and Smith the disgrace of a full exposure of their misrepresentations; and in this view we cheerfully coincided with them in a brief and solemn declaration that the pamphlet put forth by these gentlemen was not adapted to convey the full and fair impression produced on our minds by Mr. Carey's examination, but that it was adapted to mislead the public mind, and to do injustice to all the parties concerned in the examination and subsequent ordination. Every member of the Committee who united in this declaration, felt and acknowledged that it was utterly inadequate to express his sense of the unfairness of the "Statement" of the two doctors; but all agreed that it was best to say no more to their disparagement than was necessary, and that enough was said to impair the credit of their statement, and to show that it was a one-sided affair which no candid mind should trust to guide it to a fair conclusion. And there we would gladly have left the matter, in hopes that the laity of the Church would have had sufficient confidence in their bishop to abide by his judgment. Nor if the minds of our laity had been left to their own spontaneous operation, should we have been disappointed.—"Laicus," and "Robert Court," in our last, spoke their sentiments, and proved that a pamphlet, which to every intelligent Churchman carried its own refutation, would have had not the weight of a feather in opposition to the solemn and deliberate judgment of the Bishop of the Diocese. But it has long been the misfortune, the reproach, and the fault of the Churchmen of this city—one which we know they have long felt and lamented, and which it is now time for them to remedy,—that there is no daily paper in this city conducted on principles congenial to their Church; none which exercises even a neutral influence in their favor; none which is not often positively and gratuitously offensive to their holy faith; none even of those whose editors are professedly Churchmen, (as the events of the last week have proved,) which is not ready, without reasonable cause, without an appearance of cause sufficient to weigh with any intelligent and well-principled Churchman, to turn upon their bishop and their Church, and seek to cover both with odium and insult. It is to these journals, which affect to deprecate Church controversies, and yet in the same breath have the effrontery to charge the bishop of this diocese, and five at least of his most respected presbyters, with an attempt to "undermine" their Church, and to say that they ought to be separated from her communion—and whose ignorant declamation has of course had its effect, that the Church is to thank for an exposure of the misstatements of Drs. Anthon and Smith, which we, for our part, would most gladly have spared them.

Besides an unwillingness to expose the authors of the "Statement," there was another consideration which weighed strongly with our own mind, and yet more strongly with other members of the Committee; and that is, that the proceedings of the Committee of Examination were of a confidential nature, and could not be spread before the public without a betrayal of confidence. If the editor had felt, as he certainly did not feel, the least wish to retort the unjust and offensive imputations made in the "Statement" upon himself personally, he would still have felt that his lips were sealed; and that however much the two doctors might have deserved to be exposed, a sense of honor required him to be silent. And such, but for the course of the daily press, would have been our conduct; we should have suffered in silence. But if Public Opinion, to which in a matter of this nature we ought not to be held responsible, will persist in dragging us before its tribunal, and in visiting the penalty of our silence not on our own head, but on the Church, why then say we, let Public Opinion have our evidence; and accordingly we proceed to give it as we would in a court of justice, regardless of whom or where it hits, and leaving it for judge and jury to make what use of it they please.

To expose all the misstatements of the pamphlet, in one number of our paper, is impossible; we shall, therefore, at present confine ourselves to those leading ones by which the public have been chiefly abused: and in doing so, we shall drop for a few moments the usual editorial style, and adopt another more suited to our purpose, and which will enable us at once both to give our own testimony, and to make comments on the "Statement."

"The following was the question proposed:

Q. 1. 'Supposing entrance into the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country were not open to you, would you, or would you not, have recourse, in such case, to the ministry of the Church of Rome?'

Answer. 'Possibly I might, after due deliberation, but think that I should more likely remain in our own communion, as I have no special leaning towards the joining of theirs at present.'

Dr. Seabury having objected to this question being put, and having advised the examined not to answer, the right thus to advise was questioned by us, as preventing our arriving at a knowledge of the sentiments actually held by Mr. Carey, and thus defeating the very object of the examination. The bishop decided that the candidate might be advised by any one presbyter whom he might select. Dr. Smith then asked of the bishop whether the examined was to be allowed the benefit of counsel. The bishop did not recede from his decision. Exception was taken to the decision, as sanctioning a mode wholly unprecedented; but the exception was not strongly pressed by us."*

It is true that I objected to the question, and I did so on the ground of its being a hypothetical question, and as such, a trap to the conscience. I objected gravely, and to illustrate my meaning related the case of a young man who, while under examination for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, was asked by a clergyman who desired to defeat his ordination, whether he were willing, if GOD should call him thereto, to renounce home, and family, and all that he held dear on earth, and go on a mission to the wilds of Siberia, or some like spot. Gentlemen, said the Moderator, it will be time enough for the young man to answer that question when he *is* called to such mission. Dr. M'Vickar remarked, that they might as well ask Mr. C. whether if he had lived in the time of the patriarchs he would have married two wives! I supposed—and it seems I was right—that the mode of examination on the part of the two doctors was adopted with a view to publication, and I thought the question one from which the candidate on many accounts ought to have been shielded by the bishop. Mr. Carey, however, expressed a desire to answer; and he did answer. He said that the case supposed would be a painful one; that he did not know what he should do; that certainly he should come to no hasty decision on so grave a matter; that he should *spend two or three years at least* in deliberating on the subject; that at the expiration of that time he possibly might seek admission to the ministry in the Church of Rome; but that he thought it more probable he should remain a layman in his own Church, since he was satisfied with it, was attached to it, and had no disposition to leave it. The two doctors, however, insisting on a categorical answer, or the nearest to it that might be, Mr. Carey replied:

"Possibly I might, after due deliberation, but think that I should more likely remain A LAYMAN in our own communion, as I have no special leaning towards theirs at present."

The "Statement" omits the words "a layman," which it may be said are implied in what goes before, but which need to be emphasized in order to convey an idea of the sacrifice which a young man would make whose affections and education had been for years directed to the ministry.

I stop not to ask what the two doctors themselves would have done had they lived before the Reformation, or what, according to the hypothesis, they would do now; whether they would forego their inward call to the ministry, or take to preaching under the flag of Wesley; but proceed.

I may here notice in passing, a ludicrous blunder in the "Statement," and one so beside every thing in the way of reasonable probability, that in my first reading of the "Statement" I did not see it, and am indebted for the discovery of it to the N. Y. Observer. In that paper I saw it stated, that Dr. Seabury acted "as counsel" for Mr. Carey! This I thought was as near the mark as could be expected from the Observer; but what was my surprise on a second and more careful reading of the pamphlet, to find that it sustained the assertion of the Observer that Dr. S. was assigned, in the legal and technical sense of the term, as Mr. Carey's counsel! The two doctors gravely remarking in a note, that they think, on reflection, that they should then have entered "a direct protest" to the bishop's novel decision! The fact is, that after the bishop had decided that written answers might be taken from the candidate, knowing the ill use which might be made of the answers, and wishing as far as might be to shield Mr. Carey from the misrepresentations to which he would be exposed, I asked the bishop whether it would be competent for the presbyters to advise Mr. C. on the propriety or impropriety of answering the questions which might be put to him. He answered, certainly, that the candidate might be so advised by any presbyter. But the idea that I was to act as Mr. Carey's counsel, (as if the two doctors were his accusers,) never entered my mind; and although I have not since exchanged a word with the bishop or any member of the Committee on this point, I shall certainly be much surprised to learn that the idea was not equally droll to them.

"Dr. Smith then proposed question 2 in the following words:

Q. 2. 'Do you hold to, and receive the decrees of the Council of Trent?'

His answer was, 'I do not deny that the decrees of the Council—'

Mr. Carey had proceeded thus far in his reply, when, at the request of Drs. Seabury, Berrian, M'Vickar, and Mr. Haight, he declined repeating the words next in order, as Dr. Anthon desired, so as to allow him time to take down the full answer: the advice being grounded upon the loss of time it would occasion to take down, in this manner, all the answers.

Dr. Smith here observed, 'Brethren, are we running a race against time? Are we not rather assembled to discharge a solemn duty to the Church, and not to consult our personal convenience? Ought we not to be willing, if necessary, to remain here till 12 o'clock to-night, and assemble again to-morrow, and remain the entire day, if needful, so as to come to a just conclusion?'

Mr. Carey finally expressed his willingness to repeat his answer to the question, which he did in the following words, which were taken down by Dr. Anthon.

Ans. 'I do not deny them—I would not positively affirm them.'"

A more unfair statement than this I cannot imagine. For Mr. Carey expressly stated,—1. That he did not regard the Council of Trent as œcumenical, and of course that he held its peculiar definitions to be open points, and not of faith; 2. That in what he might say favorably of the decrees of Trent, he took the decrees in the mere letter, and not as interpreted by the Romish system, and the concurrent sense of the Roman divines; and 3. That he held the Roman Church responsible for the errors of her system, and the teaching of her doctors.

How the authors of the "Statement" can answer to their consciences, for having suppressed these and such like explanations with which Mr. Carey accompanied the categorical answer which they insisted on extracting from him, is for them to say.

It should be here remarked, that Mr. Carey said nothing of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and that all which he said left him free to condemn the practical abuses and corruptions of the Roman Church.

"*Q.* 3. 'Do you, or do you not, deem the differences between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of Rome to be such as embrace *points of faith?*'

To this Mr. Carey was *understood* to reply, 'If these differences be understood to be matters of doctrine, they would embrace points of faith; but if, as is believed, they are matters of opinion, they would not.'"

In a note to page 22 of the "Statement" it is said, "that Dr. Seabury several times, in the course of his examination, made suggestions to the candidate, and offered explanations of his, Mr. Carey's meaning." Here the two doctors have substituted inference for fact. The object of my questions was not to make suggestions to Mr. Carey; but it was, if possible, to pierce the minds of the two doctors with a sense of certain broad and palpable distinctions which they either could not or would not heed, but the apprehension of which was necessary to a just appreciation of Mr. Carey's views. A question which I put in connexion with their third question will illustrate my meaning. I asked Mr. Carey whether by the word *faith*, he meant the fundamental or essential faith, or all doctrine whatsoever which might be accounted true? He answered unhesitatingly, that by the word *faith* he meant the fundamental or essential faith. Now the fundamental or Catholic faith is common to the two Churches of England and Rome, and there is certainly no difference between them "in points of faith," taking the word *faith* in the theological sense to mean the doctrines which are summed up in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the differences between the two communions pertaining to the superstructure, and not to the foundation. Now it seemed to me, that in justice to Mr. Carey, and in justice to themselves, the two doctors should heed this distinction, and not drive Mr. Carey to a categorical answer, in which the word faith should be used by him in the Anglican sense, and taken by them and the public, (for I could not divest my mind of the impression that the notes of the two doctors would be published,) in the Ultra Protestant and Romish sense; both the Ultra Protestants and the Romanists taking the word *faith* to mean any and every doctrine which they believe to have come from GOD. The two doctors, however, either could not or would not see the difference; and the consequence is, that they have here put words into Mr. Carey's mouth which he never used, and which do him even more injustice as a man of sense than as a student of theology. They make him say, that "if these differences be understood to be matters of doctrine, they would embrace points of faith; but if, as is believed, they are matters of opinion, they would not;" an answer which may seem pregnant with heresy to the two doctors, and frightful to the public; but which seems to me mere jargon. Mr. Carey's answer, for substance, was, that the differences were more than matters of opinion; that they were grave doctrines, the truth of which he was not prepared either to deny or positively to affirm; but that on one thing he was clear, *viz.*, that they were not points of faith.

"*Q.* 4. 'Do you, or do you not, believe the doctrine of transubstantiation to be repugnant to Scripture, subversive of the nature of a sacrament, and giving occasion to superstition?'

'If you do not, how can you *ex animo* subscribe the 28th Article of our Standards?'

Mr. Carey prefaced his answer to this question by reading an extract from 'Taylor's Holy Living and Dying,' as expressive of his own views, which extract could not by us be taken down; and then more briefly gave his answer in the following words, recorded by Dr. Anthon, and acceded to by Mr. Carey.

Ans. "I would answer, in general language, that I do not hold *that* doctrine of transubstantiation which I suppose our Article condemns; but that, at the same time, I conceive myself at liberty to confess ignorance on the mode of the Presence.'"

The answer here given is correct, and my only wonder is, that it is not satisfactory. No Churchman, I should think, would object to the answer as it stands; certainly not in connexion with the extract from Bishop Taylor, which occurring in one of his devotional and most popular works, might have been easily obtained, had only a reference to it been given in the statement; and still less in connexion with the explanation which the two doctors might have added, that Mr. Carey affirms that the bread and wine remain after consecration, and that the senses are to be trusted in proof of the fact; in opposition to the Romanists, who call upon men in this matter to abjure their senses, and bow to the dogmas of faith.

"*Q.* 5. 'Do you, or do you not, regard the denial of the cup to the laity an unwarrantable change in a sacrament of Christ's own institution, or as to be regarded as a mere matter of discipline?'

Ans., taken down by Dr. Smith. 'I consider it an *unwarrantable* act of discipline;' Mr. Carey subsequently preferring to substitute the word '*severe*' instead of '*unwarrantable*.'"

"6. 'On which Church do you believe the sin of schism rests in consequence of the English Reformation?—the Church of England, and, by consequence, the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, or upon the Church of Rome?'

Dr. Seabury objected to this question being put, on the ground that it was an *historical* question. Mr. Carey, under advisement, answered, 'It is an historical question.'"

Dr. Smith here appealed to the bishop against this evasion of the question, on the grounds that this was the final examination to test the meetness of the candidate for Deacons' Orders, and that this final examination embraced, according to the canon, among other points, Church History, Ecclesiastical Polity, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Constitution and Canons of the Church, and of the diocese for which he is ordained; the examination on the Ritual, the Articles, and the Canons evidently and necessarily referring to the *historical* questions on their formation, changes, &c.

The bishop having decided that the question ought to be answered, Mr. Carey, in substance, replied, 'that in some respects schism rests on both sides.' 'He considered both churches in communion with the Church of Christ.'"

I might perhaps be pardoned for expressing the wish that the two doctors had been as anxious to relate Mr. Carey's explanations as Dr. Seabury's objections. It is true that I objected to the question, (the only question, by the by, except the first, to which I did object,) though I attached little importance to the objection. I might have replied to Dr. Smith that this was *not* "the final examination to test the meetness of the candidate for deacons' orders;" I might have reminded the Rev. Dr. that *that* examination had been passed by Mr. Carey; that at the conclusion of it, the bishop and presbyters who had conducted it had deemed it satisfactory; I might have urged that this was a *special* examination instituted to ascertain the candidates *doctrinal* fitness, and that his opinion on the historical question of the Reformation might possibly serve to convey to the public (for the conviction that the notes of the two doctors would come before the public was constantly present to my mind, and mainly contributed, as I believe, to impart to the examination the unprecedented aspect which it assumed) an impression injurious to the candidate and repugnant to truth; but, as I said, I attached little importance to the objection, and cheerfully acquiesced in the bishop's decision.

As was to be expected, the brief answer of Mr. Carey given by the two doctors (as they conceive) "in substance," has conveyed to the public a false impression! "In some respects schism rests on both sides." Take the word *schism* to refer to the fact of division, and the answer is true, and expresses Mr. Carey's meaning; take the word schism to denote the formal act of separation, and the answer is false, and does not express Mr. Carey's meaning. There is a schism between the Church of England and the Methodists; so that it may be said (in view of the mutual faults of both parties) that "in some respects schism rests on both sides;" but does this imply the belief that the formal act of schism is ours and not theirs; that we cut them off from our communion, and not that they separated from us? Now Mr. Carey expressly stated, in the only expression which (out of many others of an explanatory kind, that are omitted in the Statement) the two doctors have seen fit to note down, that when he said that schism rested on both sides, he took the word schism in its large sense as referring to the fact of separation. Why was this explanation withheld? Mr. Carey most unquestionably holds the formal act of schism to be the act of the Church of Rome, and not the act of the Church of England; and his answers left that impression distinct on my mind.

"*Q.* 7. 'Is the Romish doctrine of Purgatory in any respects maintained by our Standards?'

The bishop here asked Dr. Anthon what view *he* entertained on the doctrine of Purgatory, as held by the Church of Rome; to which Dr. Anthon replied, 'that, with due respect to the chair, *he* was not under examination.' The question being then addressed to Mr. Carey, he was understood to say, in reply, 'that he considered our Standards as condemning the doctrine *popularly* held to be the Roman doctrine.'"

It was, I believe, on another occasion, that the bishop put the question to Dr. Anthon which drew from the latter the truly Protestant reply, that "with due respect to the chair, *he* was not under examination;" for I am confident that I put to Dr. Anthon the question which he here attributes to the bishop; and which the bishop may also have asked; and I put it with a friendly intention: for knowing the manifold senses in which the word *purgatory* is used, I wished the word so explained that the candidate might address his answer to the precise idea intended to be conveyed by the question of the examiner. In reply I was desired, I will not say petulantly, but unexpectedly, to address my question to the candidate under examination. Profiting by this hint, I then asked Mr. Carey whether he believed that the faithful departed, during the intermediate state, were subjected to poenal suffering, or exposed to the vindictive justice of God? Mr. C. answered promptly in the negative. Now this question brings to view the distinctive Romish error; the whole system of indulgences and of prayers for the dead, as actually practised in the Roman communion, being founded on the notion, of which no mention is made by the Council of Trent, but which is defined by the Council of Florence, and made to be *of faith* by the Creed of Pius IV., that the faithful departed are subjected in the intermediate state to poenal sufferings, and required thereby to satisfy divine justice for the sins of which they failed to repent in life. Of this and much more of a like explanatory nature which was said by Mr. Carey on this point, there is no vestige in the "Statement."

"*Q.* 8. 'Is there any countenance given in the doctrinal Standards of our Church for the idea that the departed can be benefitted by the prayers of the faithful, or by the administration of the Holy Communion? And is not *that* idea condemned by Article 31 of our Church?'

As far as Mr. Carey's answer could be ascertained, it was to this effect: 'that he supposed that idea was not condemned in that Article; his opinion being, that the language of the Article was popular language, pointed at a popular opinion which was held against the Church of Rome.'"

I can readily conceive that the two doctors might have thought the error, which really lies at the bottom of all the Romish abuses on the subject of Purgatory, to be no more than a fancy of "the subtle polemic;" but how they or any other creature, human or inhuman, on the earth or under the earth, could ever have dreamed of the departed being "benefited by the administration of the holy communion," passes all comprehension. Sorry indeed am I, that two clergymen could be found so little careful of their reputation as to frame, propound, and publish such a question to the world. The Eucharist is a sacrifice of prayer as well as a sacrament of communion; and as the two doctors apparently meant to draw a distinction between prayer and the sacrifice in the Eucharist, I suppose that what they wished to get at was, whether the latter was in itself (i. e., apart from the sacrifice of CHRIST which it commemorates) propitiatory for the sins of the departed. If they had put this question, Mr. Carey would have answered them, as he answered me, in the negative. In simply expressing the belief, however, that the faithful departed are benefited by the prayers of their brethren on earth, and that this doctrine is not contradicted by our Articles, Mr. Carey follows the sense of many of the best divines of the Anglican Church, and our own. Take, for instance, the following prayer contained in the Christian's Manual, edited by the late Bishop Hobart:

"And grant that we may all find mercy and favor with all Thy saints, who, from the beginning of the world, have pleased thee in their several generations, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and every just Spirit made perfect in the faith of thy CHRIST, from righteous Abel, even unto this day: do Thou give *them and us rest* in the region of the living, in the bosoms of our Holy Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whence sorrow and grief and lamentation are banished away, where the light of Thy Countenance visits and shines continually; and vouchsafe to *bring them and us* to the full enjoyment of Thy Heavenly Kingdom."

These words are found in "An act of Intercession, from the ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem," to be used on Friday evening in every week. The prayer comprehending both *rest* to the faithful departed, and *increase of happiness*, covers the whole of Mr. Carey's view on the subject.

"*Q.* 9. 'Do you, or do you not fault the Church of Rome in pronouncing, as she does, the Books Apocryphal Holy Scripture?'

Ans. 'I do not, either to myself or any one else, attempt to prove a doctrine out of the Apocrypha.' 'The Holy Spirit may have spoken by the Apocrypha, and the Homily asserts the same thing.' The question was here renewed, and pressed in several different shapes by the bishop. The answer elicited by his last question was to the following effect: 'I would not fault the Church of Rome for reading the *Apocrypha* for proof of doctrine.'"

The account of the answer to this question is as near the truth as could be expected from two doctors who talk about the departed being "benefited by the administration of the "Holy Communion." Mr. Carey did not say that he did not fault the Church of Rome for attempting "to prove a doctrine out of the Apocrypha." His words were, that "he did not fault the Church of Rome for reading the Apocrypha, and considering it, in a loose sense, Scripture." It is true that Mr. Carey did express the belief that "the Holy Spirit may have spoken by the Apocrypha;" and it is true that the bishop did renew the question, and skilfully elicit from Mr. Carey several quotations from the Homilies, in which the same thing is asserted; but his object was, as it seemed to me, tacitly to caution the two doctors not to run their heads against the Homilies of their Church in their zeal to trip up Mr. Carey.

To a man who knows any thing of the subject, the very question of the two doctors shows misapprehension of the subject: "Do you or do you not fault the Church of Rome in pronouncing, as she does, the Books Apocryphal, Holy Scripture?" Pray who of us can fault the Ro-

* "Here, upon reflection, we are of opinion that a direct protest should have been interposed by us, as, in the entire course of our ministry, of nearly twenty-seven years, we have never known an instance in which this privilege was either asked or accorded."

manists for this, seeing our own Church does the same, and prescribes the Books Apocryphal to be "read" in her services "for example of life and instruction of manners." Mr. Carey, with an ingenuousness which has been but ill requited, addressed his answer to what would have been a test question, paying no heed to the unmeaning question of his examiners. He said, almost in the words of our sixth article, that he did not rely on the Apocryphal books for proof of doctrine; and though I do not remember that he said, yet I know that he holds, that the Church of Rome is culpable for allowing reference to the Apocrypha in proof of doctrine. In other words, he is content, with the Sixth Article, "to fault" the Church of Rome, and not, with the two doctors, "to fault" his own Church.

"*Q.* 10. By Dr. Smith. 'Can there be a doubt that, in separating from the Church of Rome, the Church of England embraced more pure and scriptural views of doctrine? And is not the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, at present, more pure in doctrine than the Church of Rome?'

Ans. 'There can be a doubt, on the ground that the Church of England *retained* doctrinal errors, viz., the doctrines of Puritanism.' 'In some points, the Roman missal was preferable to our liturgy.' Upon the question put by the bishop, 'What those points were?' Mr. Carey was understood by us, to instance, among other points, 'the closer conformity to the ancient liturgies.' 'He held that, in a popular view, our liturgy was better than theirs in omitting metaphysical distinctions, and also in being in a tongue understood by the people.'"

Here again I must express my surprise that the two doctors could, by any possible hallucination, be led to fancy that a young man, who is not a dolt, could utter such nonsense as they have put into Mr. Carey's mouth. The Church of England, at the Reformation, *retain* the doctrines of Puritanism! *retain*, as from *before* the Reformation, errors which were never hatched till *after* the Reformation! Assuredly Mr. Carey said nothing of the kind. What he did say, and what he repeated distinctly and emphatically, was, that the Church of England, after she became settled in the Reformation, was *much purer, both in doctrine and practice, than she had been before.*

The next words which the "Statement" puts in Mr. Carey's mouth are, "In some points the Roman Missal was preferable to our Liturgy." An odd comparison, truly, (if, as is doubtless the case, the "Statement" means by "our Liturgy" the Book of Common Prayer,) and one which Mr. Carey never made. It was the "Roman Breviary" which he said he thought preferable in some respects to our Liturgy; and the reasons which he assigned for the preference were, that the Breviary contained more copious citations from Scripture, and a richer variety of services. "He held," says the "Statement," "that in a popular view our Liturgy was better than theirs in omitting metaphysical distinctions." "Metaphysical distinctions" in a Liturgy! Was ever such crucifixion of a sensible man's meaning? Mr. Carey's words were, that for the purposes of congregational worship our Liturgy was better than theirs, *in avoiding all that might give occasion to idolatry*, and also in being in a tongue understood by the people.

"The greater conformity to the ancient *Liturgies*" was referred by Mr. Carey, neither to the Breviary nor to the present Roman Missal, (which would have been strangely absurd) but to the Canon of the Mass; and here the parallel was run by Mr. Carey, not between it and the communion service of our Church, but between it and the communion service of the Church of England; which, as is confessed by the best Anglican divines, is defective, and was pronounced (as Bishop White informs us) by the first bishop of our American Church, to be essentially defective. Mr. Carey said that the Roman Canon of the Mass was preferable to the Communion Service of the Church of England, and in closer conformity with the ancient Liturgies; all of which have, what the Communion Service of the Church of England wants, "The Oblation" and "The Invocation."

I do not remember that a word was said of the Roman Missal, and I know that if the comparison had been instituted between the Communion Service in our Prayer-book and the present Roman Missal, Mr. Carey would most fully and unequivocally have declared his preference for the former, and have condemned the interpolations, additions, and corruptions, with which the modern Romanists have encrusted and defiled their ancient Canon. By the by, it may be worth mentioning, that on subsequent inquiry of Mr. Carey, I have learned from him that he never read the Roman Missal, and knows nothing more of it than is to be gathered from Brett's translation and Palmer's notes.

"*Q.* 11. 'What construction do you put upon the promise of conformity to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church?'

Ans. 'He did not consider (as we understood Mr. Carey to say) the articles as binding our consciences in points of faith,' and read a passage from 'White's Memoirs of the Church,' (Convention of 1801,) which he considered as maintaining the same opinion.

'He does not feel himself obliged to give his *ex animo* assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, as the assent is given in the English Church.'

"As we understood Mr. Carey to say." The reader is by this time prepared to suspect that Mr. Carey's words could hardly pass through the understanding of the two doctors without being changed from white to black. The Articles not binding on the conscience in points of faith! Why these are exactly the points on which the Articles are binding on the consciences, both of laity and clergy, under pain of damnation. Mr. Carey most assuredly said no such thing; nor can I imagine the reason of this absurd statement, (supposing there were a reason,) except it be that the two doctors, in the event of failing to make Mr. Carey a Papist, were determined to make him a Pagan.

What Mr. Carey did say was, that in points *not* of faith, he did not consider the Articles to be binding on the conscience under pain of damnation. In other words, in regard to the controverted points between us and Rome, Mr. Carey did not consider that our Church imposes the *negative*, as the Roman Church does the *affirmative* on the conscience under penalty of damnation. This error, which Mr. Carey persisted in disclaiming in spite of the efforts of the two doctors to extort from him a confession of it, is one which the Romanists constantly impute to us, as knowing that it would be a death-blow to our existence as a branch of the Christian Church; and as Mr. Carey referred to many divines of the Church of England, and especially to Bishop Bull, in support of his view, I will here quote from the latter the passage to which Mr. Carey referred, and which he afterwards pointed out to me in Bishop Bull's Works, vol. 2, p. 211, of the Clarendon edition:

"As for our being concluded by the Articles of our Church, if he means [the bishop is here arguing against a Papist] our being obliged to give our internal assent to every thing delivered in them upon peril of damnation, it is confessed that few, yea, none of us, that are well advised, will acknowledge ourselves so concluded by them, nor did our Church ever intend we should. For she professeth not to deliver all her Articles (all, I say, for some of them are coincident with the fundamental points of Christianity) as essentials of faith, without the belief whereof no man can be saved; *but only propounds them as a body of safe and pious principles, for the preservation of peace, to be subscribed and not openly contradicted by her sons.*"

"And read a passage from 'White's Memoirs,' * * which he considered as maintaining the same opinion." Which *he considered!* Why Mr. Carey referred to a matter of fact, to the known laws of the two Churches of England and our own, about which there is and can be no difference of opinion. Bishop White, in the passage referred to, states the fact, that in the English Church a distinct and *ex animo* subscription to the Articles is required, while in our Church there is required only a general promise of "conformity to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

Then comes the categorical answer which, in reference to the impression which it conveys to the public mind, is unfair to a degree only short of falsehood. Mr. Carey said in effect: "Gentlemen, I am ready to subscribe to the Articles *ex animo*, as is done in the English Church; but I must say, that if I were disposed to stand on my rights, this is more than you could require of me; for it is more than our Church requires. Our Church requires of me only a general promise of conformity to all her doctrines, without obliging me to profess a separate and *ex amino* assent to her Articles. Such is the law of our Church, and such my right under her law; but I am perfectly willing to waive this right, and to give my *ex animo* assent to the Thirty-nine Articles as the assent is given in the English Church."

"Previous to our putting to Mr. Carey our twelfth question, the following questions were put by us to him:

Q. 1. 'Can you subscribe to the 22d Article?'

Ans. 'I could subscribe to it, considering it as referring to the popular doctrine of the Romish Church.'"

The fair answer of Mr. Carey to this question as gathered from all that he said in the course of a protracted examination, was, I think, this: 1. That there is an historical difficulty in the way of making the twenty-second Article refer to the Decrees of Trent, viz., that the Decrees of Trent to which the Article is supposed to refer, were not promulgated until *after* the Articles were set forth. But, 2. That if the twenty-second Article were held to refer to the Decrees of Trent, he must understand it to refer to the Decrees not as taken in the mere letter, and as they appear to an ingenuous Protestant, anxiously desirous to approximate them to Catholic verities, but as they appear when taken in connexion with the popular system of the Church of Rome, with the current teaching of her doctors, and with the corruptions and abuses which that Church upholds. This, I repeat, is the impression, which, I think, a candid and intelligent mind would have derived from Mr. Carey's examination; and it is the opinion which I know that he holds.

"It was here objected to the candidate by Dr. Smith, that the change made in the article disproved the idea of its referring to the popular doctrine. As the article stood in the reign of Edward VI., it was styled 'the doctrine of the schoolmen;' but after its endorsement by the Council of Trent, it was styled the '*Romish doctrine.*'"

I quote this passage merely to express in passing, my thanks to Professor Wilson, who so ably, and to the universal satisfaction of the Church, fills the chair of Systematic Theology, for having directed the attention of his class to the fact which the passage brings to view, in the presence of the Rev. Dr. Smith and myself, a day or two before the examination of Mr. Carey. Whether Dr. Smith, as well as myself, is obliged to the professor for a piece of information which contrasts so favorably with the rest of the "Statement," is more than I know.

"Touching the doctrine of the invocation of saints, mentioned in this article, the question was asked by Dr. Smith 'whether that doctrine had any warrant in Scripture?' He replied that 'it had not.' The question was farther put by Dr. S., 'whether it were right to introduce or observe the practice without any warranty from Scripture;' to which it was replied 'that it was not forbidden.' The examination was farther prosecuted by the bishop, when the candidate, in reply to a question touching the lawfulness of the practice, was understood to say that 'he did not fault the Church of Rome, provided the invocation was confined to the '*ora pro nobis*,' or intercessory form.'"

The impression conveyed by this passage to the reader doubtless is, that Mr. Carey thought that the Invocation of Saints, though unwarranted by Scripture, might yet be safely introduced and observed in the services of the Church. Mr. Carey's examination gave no countenance to such an impression. The words "it was not forbidden" referred by the two doctors to the *practice*, was referred by Mr. Carey to the *doctrine* of Invocation. Now a doctrine, neither warranted nor forbidden by Scripture, may be innocently held by individuals, while the practice which may be grafted on it is felt to be dangerous to individuals, and utterly unfit to be incorporated into a Liturgy. This is just Mr. Carey's view in regard to the Invocation of Saints; and as I am writing not only to correct the misrepresentations of the two doctors, but also to counteract the impression which they have conveyed to the public, I may be here allowed to repeat the statement lately made in the Churchman, that Mr. C. has never practised nor felt a desire to practise the Invocation of Saints; that his views on this subject are the same as those which I lately made the basis of a review of Dr. Charles Constantine Pise's book, and that no man has expressed to me his approbation of that review with more gust than Mr. Carey.

It is true that Mr. Carey said that he did not fault the Church of Rome, provided the Invocation was confined to the '*ora pro nobis*,' or intercessory form; but what of this, when the Church of Rome, in her Breviary, her Pontifical and her Missal, carries the Invocation far beyond this form? But enough on this head.

"*Q.* 2. 'How do you understand the last clause of the 19th article, viz., "As the Church of Hierusalem, &c., have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith?" The answer was substantially this: 'I understand the article in an historical sense—as referring to the *past*, and not to the *present* state of the Church of Rome.' The last section of the article he considered 'as directed against the abiding infallibility of the Church of Rome, as a particular branch of the Church universal.'"

Mr. Carey here referred the two doctors to Palmer's Treatise on the Church, expressing his regret, if I remember right, that the book was not at hand. The following is the passage of the able antagonist of Dr. Wiseman, to which Mr. Carey referred:—"The article only affirms that the Roman Church *has erred* in matters of faith, e. g., in the case of Liberius and Honorius, there is no assertion that it *does* now err in faith. The object is to deny the infallibility of the particular Church of Rome."

Now Mr. Palmer is, perhaps, the most able and determined opponent of the Church of Rome now living; and yet he here assumes, as a thing not to be denied, that there is no difference in faith between the Churches of England and Rome. Such is the constant language of the best systematic divines of the Anglican Church, from the Reformation downwards.

"The question was then pressed in another form, viz.: 'Do you consider the Church of Rome *now* to be in error in matters of faith?'

Dr. Seabury here repeatedly objected to the candidate's answering, and he accordingly declined answering. The question, however, being pressed, and the bishop deciding that it must be answered, the final reply was in the following words, taken down by Dr. Anthon:

Ans. 'It is a difficult question, which I do not know how to answer; but I refer to my answer on the other question, touching my opinion of the decrees of the Council of Trent.'"

My objections were not made to the *question*, nor was there any dispute in the committee, or decision of the Bishop, as far as I remember, about the question being put. The nature of my objections, and of Mr. Carey's difficulty, will appear from a brief statement of the facts. The two doctors desired a categorical answer to the question, "Is or is not the Church of Rome now in error in matters of faith?" Mr. Carey replied, that there was no difference between the two churches in faith; and directly as Dr. Anthon took his pen to reduce the answer to writing, I arose and expressed my sense of the unfairness of the procedure: that when Mr. Carey, taking the word *faith* in the theological sense, declared what was most undoubtedly true, the two doctors, by means of their minutes, should thus be able to make Mr. Carey appear responsible for a declaration which, the word faith being taken in the popular sense, was utterly false, and did not convey his meaning at all. And as Dr. Anthon's previous admonition to the bishop, as well as to myself, foreclosed all opportunity of mutual explanation with him; and as an explanation, if begun with Dr. Smith, might have been pending still; I had no other resource, than either to renew my objections to their extraordinary proceeding of taking minutes, or to propound such questions to the candidate, as might serve to elicit his meaning to the comprehension of the two doctors. I did both; and my questions drew from Mr. Carey the distinct avowal, that by the word *faith* he meant *fundamentals*, and not Christian doctrine in general. This the two doctors thought was prompting Mr. Carey, and suggesting to him his answers; and accordingly, without heeding the explanations which I drew from Mr. Carey, they continued to press him to a categorical answer. Now, if Mr. C. had, with Palmer and our best systematic divines, answered the question in the negative, i. e., that there was no difference *in faith* between the Church and the Romanists, he would have given the two doctors, (as it seems he has given them, and through them the public,) the impression that he was a downright papist; and on the other hand, if he answered in the affirmative, viz., that the Church of Rome is in error *in faith*, i. e., in fundamentals, he would have done violence to his own sense, and contradicted the ablest divines of our Church from the Reformation downward. Thus pressed, Mr. Carey, after various evolutions, meekly replied, "Gentlemen, it is a difficult question, which I do not know how to answer!"

I come now to Pope Pius' creed. At page 23 of the "Statement," Mr. Carey is made to answer that he receives the articles of the Creed of Pius IV., so far as they are repetitions of the decrees of the Council of Trent." This is repeated p. 27; and p. 38 it grows to be "a distinct avowal of the conjoint reception of the decrees of Trent, the Creed of Pius IV, and," &c. Again, p. 42, the question is said to be, "Will Churchmen be content that even they who are to minister to them in holy things, shall come to them with a double creed—with the Thirty-nine articles and the Creed of Pius IV., with the Prayer-Book and the Missal?" And that exactly the right, i. e., the blackest impression, might be made on the public mind, the Creed of Pius IV. is published at the end of the pamphlet, to certify to the world, what? why that Mr. Carey is a villain; a villain of the basest dye.

That men who do not distinguish between Articles of Faith and Articles of Religion; who think a man a Papist for calling the Apocrypha Holy Scripture; who can confound the Breviary and the Missal; who can talk about the errors of Puritanism being retained in the Church from before the Reformation, and who can gravely ask, whether the Saints in Paradise can be benefited by the administration of the Holy Communion on earth; that such men may, without intentional guilt, avouch to the world that Mr. Carey has made "a distinct avowal of the * * reception of * * * the creed of Pius IV," is what I can understand; but that such an act, whatever were its motives, will be suffered to pass without punishment by some law, either civil or ecclesiastical, is what I shall be slow to believe.

The question was put "Do you, or do you not, receive the articles of the creed of Pius IV?" In justice to himself, and in perfect truth, ay, and with the most exact expression of truth, Mr. Carey might have answered to this insiduous question, No; not a solitary one of them! For what is a creed? It is a summary of those articles of Faith which are necessary to salvation; to be received under peril of damnation; and to be held as bound on the conscience by the awful words, "He that believeth not shall be damned!" Mr. Carey had again and again declared that in receiving the decrees of Trent in that mild construction of them by which, good men have sought to approximate them to Catholic verities, *he rejected the damnatory clauses.* How could he then receive the matters embraced in these decrees as "Articles of a Creed?" For no good purpose, I fear, was the question pressed; nevertheless it was pressed. Now if Mr. Carey had answered in the negative, and declared that he did not receive one of the Articles of Pope Pius' Creed, he would have said indeed the truth, but he would have used words which he knew would be understood by the two doctors in a different sense from that which he intended to convey. Thus pressed he gave an answer, the ingenuousness of which I respect, whatever I may think of the use which has been made of it.

There is, I think, a wide difference between receiving the Articles of Pope Pius' creed, considered *as* repetitions of Tridentine decrees, and receiving the Tridentine decrees considered *as* articles of Pope Pius' Creed. In the one case a man may hold them to-day and reject them to-morrow; may hold them as speculations of the closet, without favoring the practice that is grafted on them: in the other case he must hold them irrevocably, and adopt the practical corruptions which the Church of Rome grafts upon them. And to see this yet more plainly, the reader has only to consider the phraseology of the Creed: "I promise, vow, and swear most constantly to retain and profess, &c." How different from Mr. Carey's language, "I do not deny them, but I would not positively affirm them!"

Before Mr. Carey is condemned for this declaration, it might be as well for his censors to reflect how far they are in the same predicament. I believe that there are many of these decrees which even those Churchmen who are Calvinistic in their tendencies, and low in their Churchmanship, would readily assent to, and which might sadly cross the views of some old Arminians; and many more which those, who like the two doctors, desire to be thought "Bishop Hobart men," would readily assent to, which would equally cross their Low Church brethren. For instance there are few Low Churchmen who would not agree with me in the following, the damnatory clause excepted.

"[If any one asserts] that he [Adam] being stained with the sin of disobedience, transmitted death and corporal penalties only, upon all the human race, and not also sin, which is the death of the soul, let him be accursed."

Now this decree is contained in Pope Pius' Creed; but do the Low Churchmen receive it *as* an article of that creed? If so, they would excommunicate and anathematize the venerable Bishop White, and many others (if alive) who have expressly denied the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity.

Again, such "Bishop Hobart men" as the two doctors, must agree with the Council in the following decrees, the damnatory clauses excepted:

"If any shall say, that all Christians have power to minister the word, and all the sacraments; let him be accursed."

"If any shall say that real and natural water is not necessary in Baptism; and so shall pervert the words of our Lord Christ, 'Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost,' into some metaphor; let him be accursed."

"If any shall say, that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy, appointed by Divine Ordination, which consists of Bishops, presbyters, and ministers; let him be accursed."

These decrees, too, are contained in the creed of Pius IV; but do the two doctors, therefore, receive them as articles of that creed? If so, then they are bound to refuse communion with their Low Church brethren, and either turn them out of our Church, or go over themselves to Rome.

I might proceed to quote a large number of the decrees of Trent to which no good Churchman would except; all which are contained in Pope Pius' creed, but none of which any Churchman could accept *as* contained in that creed. I beg the reader, therefore, to observe that Romanism does not consist in receiving the decrees of Trent, but in receiving them as binding on the conscience, under pain of damnation, so as not to hold religious communion with those who deny them. The two doctors give great prominence to the fact that Mr. Carey received the decrees of Trent, and slur over, as if a matter of little or no moment, the fact that he rejects the damnatory clauses. But this is the very *essence* of Romanism; for it is by the admission of these clauses that a man *is*, and by the denial of them that a man is *not* a Romanist. Romanism without its anathemas! The creed of Pius IV without its damnatory clauses! Why they may as well talk of vinegar without its sourness, or gall without its bitterness; it being the very essence of Romanism not to receive few, or many, or all of the Tridentine decrees, but to receive and bind them on the conscience as part of that essential faith without which no man can be saved.

This is the distinction and it seems to me the distinctive glory of our Church, that she binds only the fundamental faith on the consciences of her members, leaving them free on all subordinate matters; this is the solution of that perpetual enigma to her enemies, *viz.*, that she is subject to occasional excitements and controversies, without danger of division or schism. This feature it mainly is, which is to secure the triumph of the Church in these United States; and heaven forefend the day when either High Churchmen or Low Churchmen should cherish the wish to bind their distinctive tenets on the conscience, as part of the faith of Christ. If any men on either side drive at this, *they* are either sectarians or Romanists; and it is to be hoped that such (if such there be) will speedily leave the Church and join either the sectaries or Rome.

For this reason I say, that even if it were true—as it is not—that Mr. Carey receives the matter contained in Pope Pius' Creed, it would still be false, most injuriously false, to represent him as receiving that creed.

An unexpected letter from a learned friend, furnishes here another point:

"*My Dear Dr.*—On Saturday "The True Issue" made its appearance in this quarter, and I have finished reading it this morning. In page 23, Mr. Carey is made to answer that he receives "The Articles of the Creed of Pius IV., so far as they are repetitions of the Decrees of the Council of Trent." This is repeated in a more aggravated form, p. 27. And in p. 38, it is called "A distinct avowal of the conjoint reception of the Decrees of Trent, the Creed of Pius IV., and our own Standards." Again, in p. 42, the question is said to be: "Will Churchmen be content, that even they who are to minister to them in holy things, shall come to them with a double creed—with the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Creed of Pius IV., with the Prayer Book and Missal?"

Now I cannot believe, with my present information, that this is a fair statement of Mr. Carey's admissions. The Creed of Pope Pius IV, is to be received according to the Animus Imponentis. The Church which that creed means, is not the Catholic Church as we view it, but the Catholic Church as that Council viewed it, viz: the Roman Schism. Consequently to receive the Creed of Pius IV., is in fact entire conformity to the Church of Rome. That creed pronounces that Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege, yet it is a notorious fact, that the Church of Rome constantly commits this sacrilege, if the Orders of the Anglican Church be valid. It is not to be supposed that a young man so excellent in every respect as Mr. Carey, so scrupulous about right and wrong, and so well informed as to all the points of controversy, could or would have presented himself for Deacons' Orders in our Church, for the very purpose of being guilty of sacrilege. For, whatever may be said on the part of the Church of Rome, the guilt of sacrilege must remain on the conscience of the individual who could wilfully and knowingly receive orders in our Church, when he had doubts as to our Orders or jurisdiction. I cannot conceive of any motive which could lead Mr. Carey to receive Orders in our Church under such circumstances. He is not one who would trifle with sacred things. I conclude, therefore, that the pamphlet does not contain a true statement of facts.

I am glad to perceive by the declaration of Dr. Berrian and others, that no counter statement will be published by them, and that in justice to Mr. Carey, they deny the correctness of the answers as exhibited in the pamphlet."

But supposing the statement of the two doctors to be so softened down as to express the fact of Mr. Carey's reception of that creed, apart from its character as a creed; I affirm that even this is extremely false. I do not impute intentional falsehood to the two doctors; for they have doubtless written on the supposition that the Creed of Pius IV, contained nothing more than the Decrees of Trent, the error of which supposition, I will briefly show.

1. The Creed of Pius IV., contains a promise of true obedience to the Bishop of Rome as Vicar of Jesus Christ; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

2. The Creed of Pius IV., contains a confession that the *Roman* Church is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

3. The Creed of Pius IV., obliges its recipient to take the Holy Scriptures in that sense which the *Roman* Church puts on them, and to regard the *Roman* Church as the judge of controversies; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

4. The Creed of Pope Pius obliges its recipient steadfastly to admit and embrace all the traditions and observances of the *Roman* Church; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

5. The Creed of Pope Pius obliges its recipient to receive and admit the approved ceremonies of the *Roman* Church in the administration of the sacraments; of which there is not a word in the Council of Trent.

The two first of these differences are expressed in Pope Pius' Creed; and that the other three are contained in it, will be denied only by a papist.

Now these, I apprehend, are such differences as utterly falsify the declaration twice expressly made in the "Statement," that Mr. Carey avowed his reception of Pope Pius' Creed; an avowal which Mr. Carey never made, and never dreamed of making; but which the two doctors have *inferred* from what he said about the Decrees of Trent. I do not impute deception to the two doctors, but I blame them, and I trust that on reflection they will blame themselves, for the precipitancy with which they have published their libel to the world.

To the Editor of the Churchman.

"July 26th.

"Rev'd Sir,—Allow me to make one single remark on page 7, line 7, of the 'Statement:' 'He very frankly admitted them, one only excepted,' &c. These words have reference to my private examination by Dr. Smith, on his having mentioned to me certain sayings, which he had heard attributed to me.

"Even now that the doctor has thought fit to *publish* his minute of my private interview with him, (nay, to publish as well the copy which I did *not* correct, as the one which I did,) I cannot bring myself to say more than I said when he put my conversation in *writing*; "I should not have done so towards him." (Statement, page 11.) I shall therefore confine myself simply to a comment on the words which I have pointed out above, premising that even this I make, with no desire to impute intentional unfairness to the doctor, but merely because, as he and I were alone at the time, *none can speak on the subject, except himself and me.* It will show, however, how differently the same thing may appear, when viewed from different points.

"The doctor had heard several expressions attributed to me, and on them he based his first examination. One I expressly denied, as morally impossible. The others I said I might have used, *because, in a certain modified sense, I was willing to defend them. The modification (which is all omitted in the document) was therefore absolutely necessary, to get at my meaning.* I did not distinctly recollect making such remarks, but said, I never could have made them, except in such and such a sense. I did not volunteer the strong language which the doctor drew out of me in confidence, as that which I should prefer, or naturally adopt, but as language which could be justified by explanation. I do not see how I could have done otherwise, when an examination was based, not on our standards, but on previous rumors.

"When on our second meeting, the doctor took me through the Articles, he did not perceive any hesitation in my answers; nor did I gather that he objected at all to my view of the whole subject of justification, merit, works before and after justification, works of supererogation, and sin after baptism, the topics which were principally handled between us. I might add, by the way, that the point of the *Papal Supremacy never came up*, though had it done so, I could easily have shown him my difference from the Church of Rome in that important particular. 'Frank' I certainly was in my statements, as I had entire confidence in the Rector of St. Peter's, but that frankness did not lead me to make, *de novo*, the obnoxious statements, but only to show in what manner I thought them defensible.

Yours respectfully,

Arthur Carey.

Episcopal Visitation.—Bishop Onderdonk, having been requested by the Presiding Bishop to be present at the consecration of the Bishop elect of Rhode Island, which is expected to take place at Providence, in that Diocese, on Friday, August 11th, has accordingly made a change in the *whole rule* of his appointments *after July 30th.* Circumstances necessarily require the postponement of some of them until after the convention. Appointments have been added for *Milesquare* and *Pelham.*

We learn that the Rev. A. Jackson, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in Washington College, sailed last week in the Montezuma, for a visit to England, Scotland, and the Continent. We regret that ill health has been the chief cause for this temporary resignation of his official duties, and sincerely trust that he may be returned in the full enjoyment of the faculties, which he has heretofore so unweariedly devoted to the trust in which he has served the Church.

NOTICE TO APPLICANTS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

At a meeting of the Education Committee, held on the subject of applications:

Resolved, That all applications to this Board for Seminary Scholarships, (other than provided for by College nomination or endowment,) be held subject, after approval of papers by the Education Committee, to the Report of the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary on the examination of such applicants for entrance into the same, and that with a view to carry out this provision the Faculty be respectfully requested to report the result of such examination, giving the comparative rank of such competitors for the prize.

Resolved, That until otherwise provided for, the Board will be governed by such order of merit in all subsequent appointments to the open Scholarships of the Board—the number of the same to be determined, from time to time, upon Report from the Treasurer of the state of the education funds of the diocese.

John M'Vickar,
Chairman of Education Committee.

Of the time and place of such examination, due notice will be given through the columns of the Churchman. Papers of applicants addressed to the Chairman, will be received and laid before the Education Committee up to the 1st of September next.

John M'Vickar,
Chairman of Education Committee.

New York, July 24, 1843.

From the Banner of the Cross.

The True Issue for the True Churchman: *A Statement of Facts in Relation to the recent Ordination in St. Stephen's Church, New York.* By Drs. Smith and Anthon. New York: Harper & Brothers; 8vo., pp. 46.

We should much prefer not saying a word of this pamphlet, or again alluding to the extraordinary conduct (so little creditable to the authors) which called it forth. But as silence might be imputed to a disposition to shrink from editorial responsibility, we shall frankly and fearlessly express our opinion. Our readers may depend at all times on receiving the earliest and most accurate information attainable, of every thing of real importance which may occur in the Church; nor shall we be the last to sound the alarm at the approach of any thing, from any quarter, which may seem to threaten actual danger to the purity and integrity of those great principles of "Gospel Truth, and Primitive Ecclesiastical Order," in defence of which our banner is lifted up. But we must be excused if we do not always choose, by noticing, to give importance to "trifles light as air"—or to join in the hue and cry which may be raised by every hasty and intemperate zealot who takes it into his head that the salvation of the Church depends upon all others joining in his quixotic battles with the logical windmills. We could not refrain a smile at the solemn peroration of the two New York Doctors: "*A great issue*," they tell us, "*has been joined*, through circumstances apparently at once casual and trivial. . . . We can regard this only as providential; as though God himself had thus unexpectedly opened the way for the discussion, and perhaps the settlement of great principles, and the consequent peace, purity, and prosperity of his Church."

We had hoped that the "sober second thoughts" of the authors, or the advice of judicious friends, would have induced them to withhold any further publication on a subject which certainly, the sooner forgotten, the better for their reputation. Though disappointed in this, we still earnestly hope that the pamphlet will be suffered to drop quietly into the tomb of oblivion. Had Drs. Anthon and Smith contented themselves with their protest of July 1, (presented to their bishop on learning the decision of every member of the examining committee, save themselves,) no one would ever have thought of censuring their course. But their most strange and unjustifiable procedure at the time of ordination, *after the case had been adjudicated*, might well excite, as it has done, the astonishment and grief of all sober-minded Churchmen. The perusal of their "Statement of Facts" has only confirmed us in the opinion we had previously formed, that no explanation whatever could exculpate them, and that they were only to be excused in the hope that their action was the hasty result of excited feelings. But this charitable construction they refuse to have placed upon it, and say, "If we sinned, we sinned not through impulse, but with premeditation: from first to last we *pondered* our course." It pains us thus to speak of gentlemen whom we have always been accustomed to respect so highly; but if we say any thing, we must honestly say what we think.

☞ The Trust Funds received by the Treasurer of the Domestic Committee will in future be acknowledged only in the Spirit of Missions.
139 Broadway, July 29, 1843.

CALENDAR.

JULY.

25. St. James the Apostle.
30. Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

AUGUST.

6. Eighth Sunday after Trinity.
13. Ninth Sunday after Trinity.
20. Tenth Sunday after Trinity.
24. St Bartholomew the Apostle.
27. Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

DIOCESAN RECORD.

EPISCOPAL ACTS BY THE BISHOP OF THIS DIOCESE.

Queen's County.—Thursday, July 20th, confirmed 9 in St. George's Church, Astoria.

Westchester County.—St. James the Apostle, Tuesday, July 25th, in the morning, laid the corner stone of St. Peter's Chapel, Portchester. The address was delivered by the Rev. Peter S. Chauncey, rector of Christ Church, Rye, of which church this is a chapel. Its erection is rendered necessary by the increase of the parish, particularly in the vicinity of Portchester, (about two miles from the church,) where, for a long time, a large congregation has assembled in temporary accommodations.

In the afternoon confirmed 14 in Christ Church, Rye.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR VISITATION.

Seventh Sunday after Trinity, July 30, Kingston, *Ulster County.*

Friday, August 4, *Hudson.* 5, Athens, *Greene co.*

Eighth Sunday after Trinity, August 6, Catskill. Tuesday, 8, Redhook, *Dutchess County.*

Tenth Sunday after Trinity, August 20, Norfolk, *St. Lawrence County.* Saturday, 26, Clermont, *Columbia County.*

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity, August 27, Ulster, *Ulster County.* Tuesday, 29, Hyde Park, *Dutchess County.* 30, Esopus, *Ulster County.* 31, St. Paul's Church, Poughkeepsie, *Dutchess County.* September 1, Wappinger's Creek. 2, Marlborough, *Ulster County.*

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity, September 3, A. M. Fishkill Landing, *Dutchess County.* 4 P. M., Newburgh, *Orange County.* Tuesday, 5, Monticello, *Sullivan County.* Thursday, 7, Walden, *Orange County*, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. 8, Goshen.

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 10, Fishkill, *Dutchess County.* 12, Paterson, *Putnam County*, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. Thursday, 14, Milesquare, *Westchester County*, Consecration A. M., Confirmation P. M. 15, Pelham, Consecration A. M., Confirmation P. M.

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 17, Flatbush, *Kings county.*

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 1, St. Mary's Church, *New York.*

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity, October 8, A. M. Yonkers, *Westchester County.* 3 P. M. Tuckahoe. 9, Greenburgh. 10, Tarrytown. 11, Sing Sing. Friday, 13, Peekskill.

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 15, A. M. Phillipstown, *Putnam County*; 3 P. M. Cold Spring.

Where ordinations or institutions are to take place, the candidates are expected to see that at least two Presbyters, are in attendance.

The neighboring clergy are expected to make arrangements for officiating occasionally, prior to the Bishop's visitation, and preparing candidates for confirmation, if there be any, in such of the above named parishes as are vacant.

Any other services, not inconsistent with punctually meeting the above appointments, will also be rendered with pleasure during the same period.

NOTICE.

WESTERN NEW YORK.

The Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Western New York, will meet in St. Peter's Church, Auburn, on Wednesday, the 16th day of August next, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

By order of the Bishop,

July 29, 1843. P. A. Proal, Secretary.

DR. PUSEY'S SERMON on THE EUCHARIST.

JUST published the above important Sermon, on *fine* paper, with the Original Preface, all the Notes and an Appendix, by the Author. Price 12½ cents.

Also, an edition of the same, on *common* paper. Price 6¼ cents. J. A. SPARKS, Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau street.

July 29.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE CHURCH; Its Nature, Organization, and Ministry. By Rev. George W. Nichols, M. A. Just published, and may be found at Church Depository, No. 20 John street.

July 29. 4t

JUST PUBLISHED,
DR. PUSEY'S SERMON,
ON GOOD PAPER AND LARGE TYPE.

"The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent."

A SERMON preached before the University in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the Fourth Sunday after Easter.

By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D.—Price 12 1-2 cents.

BY D. APPLETON & CO.,

July 29. 200 *Broadway*,

VALUABLE CHURCH BOOKS.
FOR SALE,
A COPY OF MELVILLE'S SERMONS.
SUMMARIES OF THE SERMONS AND DISCOURSES OF SHERLOCK AND JEREMY TAYLOR.
BY REV. T. S. HUGHES.
THE HOLY SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE TRINITY IN ESSENTIAL UNITY, AND THE SUPREME GODHEAD OF JESUS CHRIST.
AN ESSAY ON THE CHURCH,
BY REV. WM JONES, of Nayland.
SACRED CLASSICS, CONTAINING SPIRITUAL PERFECTION UNFOLDED AND ENFORCED.
TREATISES DEVOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL,
BY JOHN HALL, D. D.
BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION.

JAMES A. SPARKS,
Churchman Bookstore,
July 29. 109 Nassau street.

BISHOP HOPKINS' SECOND LETTER TO BISHOP KENRICK.

Second edition, with a Postscript.

BISHOP HOPKINS on the Prediction of the Second Advent in 1843.

The Church of Rome in her Primitive Purity, Compared with the Church of Rome at the Present Day. By the Rt. Rev. J. H. Hopkins, D. D.

The Primitive Church Compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day. By the same author.

Essay on Gothic Architecture, with various Plans and Drawings for Churches; Designed Chiefly for the use of the Clergy.

For sale at the Church Depository,

July 29. No. 20 John street.

PUBLISHED THIS DAY,

A LETTER TO A PARISHIONER, relative to the recent Ordination of Mr. Arthur Carey. By the Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, A. M., Rector of All Saints' Church, New York.

J. A. SPARKS,

July 27. Churchman's Bookstore, 109 Nassau st.

JUST PUBLISHED,
NO. VIII. OF THE
ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
EDITED BY REV. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D.D.

THIS splendid work is beautifully printed on paper of the finest quality, and will be embellished with upward of seven hundred superior engravings on wood, principally from the old masters, and will, when complete, form the most magnificent volume ever issued from the American press. Among the illustrations of the present number are, engravings from pictures by *Rembrandt, Paul Veronese, F. Verdier, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Bird, &c.*

To be completed in twenty numbers. Published semi-monthly, by

H. W. HEWET, 281 Broadway,

July 29. Price 31¼ cents.

ERRORS OF THE TIMES:

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Connecticut, at the Annual Convention, holden in Christ Church, in the city of Hartford, June 13, 1843. By the Rt. Rev. Thomas C. Brownell, D. D. LLD., Bishop of the Diocese.

(*Concluded.*)

It is not a little remarkable that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration should be regarded as so obnoxious, by all classes of dissenters, while, at the same time, it is the *authoritative teaching* of all the chief Protestant denominations in the world. This fact demonstrates the little regard which is paid by these denominations to Church authority, or to the standards of their faith;—the latitude which is given to the right of private judgment, and the widespread influence of the "new light theology."

It may well be questioned, indeed, whether the great mass of dissenters know much about their authoritative standards; and whether, even their teachers, are not mainly governed, in their interpretation of Scripture, by their own private judgment, or by the tone of public sentiment which may prevail for the time being, rather than by any deference to Church authority.

Under these circumstances, it may not be amiss to cite a few passages from the writings of the principal continental Reformers, and from the standards of some of the principal Protestant denominations, as an illustration of the departure from sound doctrine, which is spreading wider and wider every year.

Luther, the great advocate of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, thus expresses himself in commenting on Gal. iii. 27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—"This is not done by any change of vestments, nor by any law of works, *but by the new birth and renewal which takes place in baptism;* as St. Paul says, 'according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration,' &c. For besides that they are regenerated and renewed by the Holy Spirit to heavenly righteousness and everlasting life in baptism, there is kindled a new life and flame; there arise new and holy affections; fear, trust in God, hope; there ariseth a new will. Wherefore evangelically to put on Christ, is not to put on a law of works, but an inestimable gift; viz., remission of sins, righteousness, peace, consolation, joy in the Holy Ghost, salvation, and Christ himself."

The doctrine of Calvin, on this subject, is not less explicit than that of Luther. The following is cited from his Institutes of the Christian Religion, (B. IV. c. 15.) "Baptism is a sign of initiation, by which we are admitted into the Society of the Church, in order that being incorporated into Christ, we may be numbered among the children of God. It is proposed to us by the Lord, as a symbol and token of our purification; or to express my meaning more fully, it resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed unto us. For he commands all who believe, to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the principal thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' We ought to conclude, that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of sins. . . . The last advantage which our faith receives from baptism, is the certain testimony it affords us, that we are not only engrafted into the life and death of Christ, but are so united as to be partakers in all his benefits. For this reason he dedicated and sanctified baptism in his own body that he might have it in common with us, as a most firm bond of the union and society which he has condescended to form with us; so that Paul proves from it, that we are the children of God, because we have put on Christ in baptism. . . . It is a principle sufficiently known and acknowledged by all the faithful, that the right consideration of sacramental signs consists not merely in the external ceremonies, but that it chiefly depends on the *promise* and the spiritual mysteries which the Lord has appointed those ceremonies to represent. Whoever, therefore, wishes to be fully informed of the meaning of baptism, and what baptism is, must not fix his attention on the element and the outward spectacle, but must rather elevate his thoughts to the promises of God which are offered to us in it, and to those internal and spiritual things which it represents to us."

Thus these great Reformers still maintained the doctrine of the universal Church, on the subject of baptismal regeneration, and expressed themselves in language similar to that of St. Augustine, who lived a thousand years before them. "The renovation after the image of God," says St. Augustine, "is not effected in a moment, like *regeneration in baptism;* which is done in a moment by the remission of sins."

If we come down to modern times, we find in the Confession of Faith of the Dutch Reformed Church this declaration:—"Christ has commanded all those that are his to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; thereby signifying to us, that as water washeth away all the filth of the body, when poured upon it, and is seen on the body of the baptized when sprinkled upon it, so doth the blood of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, internally sprinkle the soul and cleanse it of its sins, and *regenerate* us from children of wrath unto children of God."

In the larger Catechism established by the assembly of Divines at Westminster, baptism is defined to be "A sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing of water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and *regeneration* by his spirit." The Platform or Confession of Faith agreed upon at Saybrook, and adopted by the General Assembly at New Haven, though established at a somewhat later period, still recognizes the same doctrine. It defines baptism to be "A Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign and seal of the Covenant of Grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of *regeneration*, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life."

From the foregoing extracts, we cannot fail to perceive a remarkable similarity in the standards of all the principal denominations of Protestant Christians, concerning the nature and efficacy of the sacrament of baptism. In general, the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is expressed as strongly, in the standards of the dissenters, as in that of the Church to which we belong. Indeed, this had ever been the doctrine of the universal Church of Christ, from the days of the Apostles to the period of the Reformation.

And though it may have been rejected by some of the ephemeral sects which have arisen since that time; though it may have been denied, or held in abeyance, by many of the early Puritans, it is not yet excluded from the Creeds of the principal denominations of Christians in this country, and is only practically repudiated, under the pervading influence of the "New Light doctrines" of the last hundred years.

The early Fathers of New England brought with them the stern and sober principles of Calvinism; yet they were themselves not a little tinctured with the fanaticism of their times.

But in the process of half a century, their Calvinism had lost much of its asperity, and their fanaticism had greatly moderated in its extravagances.*a* How far this mitigation may be ascribed to the peaceable possession of their field of action, and the absence of exciting causes, and how far it may have been occasioned by the admixture among them of Church of England men, who conformed to their ecclesiastical regulations, it is impossible to determine; but it seems to be an unquestionable fact, that their doctrinal views were steadily assimilating to the doctrinal views of the parent Church from which they had severed themselves. And at the end of one hundred years from the first landing at Plymouth, though still adhering to their ecclesiastical organization, their religious views, in other respects, seem not to have greatly differed from those of the Church of England. So early as the year 1662, a Synod was holden under the appointment of the general Court of Massachusetts, in which it was decided that persons baptized in infancy, "understanding the doctrine of faith, and publicly professing their assent thereunto; not scandalous in life, and solemnly *owning the covenant* before the Church, wherein they give up themselves and their children to the Lord, and subject themselves to the government of Christ in the Church, their children are to be baptized." This decision was immediately adopted by many of the churches in the Colony, and the practice under it soon became general. In 1664, the General Court of Connecticut recommended to the churches within their jurisdiction, the adoption of a regulation similar to that established by the Synod of Massachusetts; and further, "that all the children of the Church be accepted and accounted *real members* of the Church; and that the Church exercise a due Christian care and watch over them; and that when they are grown up, being examined by the officer, in the face of the Church, if it appear in the judgment of charity that they be duly qualified to participate in that great ordinance of the Lord's Supper, by their being able to examine themselves and discern the Lord's body, such persons be admitted to full communion."*b* After opposition by some of the ministers and Churches, the recommendations of the Legislature were generally adopted. At a General Court holden at New Haven, October, 1708, the Platform agreed upon at Saybrook, in September of the same year, was fully approved; and it was further ordained, that "all the churches within this government, that are, or shall be, thus united in doctrine, worship and discipline, be, and for the future shall be, owned and acknowledged *established by law.*"*c*

At the same time, it was declared to be "sufficient that a Church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice; and own, either *the doctrinal parts of those commonly called the Articles of the Church of England*, or the Confession, or Catechisms, shorter or longer, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or the Confession agreed on at the Savoy.

Under the influence of such sentiments, it is not wonderful that our fathers of those times should regard the new theology, and the new measures which were introduced a few years afterwards, and especially the fanatical spirit and the extravagances with which they were accompanied, with strong abhorrence and dismay. Resolutions of ecclesiastical associations and legislative assemblies, were fulminated against them; while those who propagated them were stigmatized as "Antinomians," "Disorganizers," and "Fanatics."*d* On the other hand, the "Old Lights" were not less bitterly denounced as "Arminians," and "Formalists." Yet the new views of religion rapidly extended their influence; not only among the Congregationalists of New England, but among the Presbyterians of the Middle and Southern States, and were destined to a signal triumph. In both bodies, indeed, schisms and dissensions were created; which were hardly yet healed, when they have broken out again in our own day, under the appellations of the "Old" and "New Schools" of Presbyterianism, and the "Old" and "New Theology" of the Congregationalists, with the appropriate "Measures" which pertain to each system. If a comparison be made between the state of morals and religion for the last hundred years, (taking into account the multiplication of sects which have sprung up, and the dissensions which have prevailed,) and that which existed during the hundred years preceding them, we shall be able to form a just estimate of the effects which have been produced by this great religious revolution.

a "As the good people who planted the country died, and the new generation came on," says Trumbull, who was himself of the New Light School, "there was a sensible decline as to the life and power of godliness. The generation which succeeded, were not in general so eminent and distinguished in their zeal, and strictness of morals, as their fathers. The third and fourth generations became still more generally inattentive to their spiritual concerns, and manifested a greater declension from the purity and zeal of their ancestors." *Hist.*, Vol. II. p. 135.

b Trumbull. Hist. Conn. Vol. I. p. 312.

c Ibid. p. 486.

d The Rev. Dr. Chauncey, of Boston, though a believer in the reality of the "work of grace" which was in progress, presents us a very striking view of "the things of a bad and dangerous tendency" which accompanied that work. He also gives us a brief account of the measures which were taken to avert the impending dangers. Among these is a Proclamation of the Government of Connecticut for a general fast, to be holden in April, 1743, to deprecate the anger of God for the prevailing sins. Among these sins are enumerated a "spirit of error, disorder, bitterness, uncharitableness, censoriousness, divisions, contentions, separations, and confusions, in the Churches." He also presents us a "*Testimony*" of the pastors of the Churches in the province of Massachusetts, held the same year, against the errors of the times. "As to errors in doctrine," say they, "we observe that some in our land look upon what are called *secret impulses* upon their minds, without due regard to the written word, as the rule of their conduct; that none are *converted* but such as *know* they are converted, and the time *when*; that *assurance* is of the essence of faith; that *sanctification* is no evidence of justification; with other *Antinomian* and *Familistical* errors." "As to disorders in practice," they reckon the innovations of *itinerant* clergymen and *lay-exhorters* among the chief. They also censure converts to the new doctrines for presuming to *judge the hearts* of their brethren, and especially of their ministers, and condemning them as "Arminians," "blind," and "unconverted." They condemn the extravagant manifestations of *terror* under "*convictions*," and undue *raptures* at receiving "*light*;" and the *noise and disorders* which frequently characterized the meetings for public worship.

The following resolution was passed by the General Association of Connecticut, in June, 1745:

"Whereas there has of late years been many errors in doctrine, and disorders in practice, prevailing in the Churches in this land, which seem to have a threatening aspect upon the Churches; and whereas Mr. George Whitefield has been the promoter, or at least the faulty occasion, of many of these errors and disorders; this Association think it needful for them to declare, that if the said Mr. Whitefield should make his progress through this government, it would by no means be advisable for any of our ministers to admit him into their pulpits, or for any of our people to attend his administrations."—*Trumbull*, Vol. II. p. 190.

The Church to which we belong has been transplanted from England to this country, chiefly within the more recent period; and has been rapidly increased, by accessions from those portions of the community who have become wearied with perpetual agitations and changes, and have sought for repose and stability in our scriptural standard of faith, and our primitive forms of worship. Built up of such materials, it need not be surprising if some of our religious views should be tinctured by the prevailing opinions which surround us. Perhaps the most desolating of all evils which have sprung out of the revolution referred to, relate to the sentiments entertained (by those who have embraced its principles) concerning the nature of baptism, and the religious education of children. Whatever vague generalities may be uttered concerning the duty of baptism, it is but too commonly regarded as a mere ceremonial observance,—a mere sign, unaccompanied by anything signified. Practically, there is an utter unbelief in its sacramental efficacy. And the pious nurture of children, whether baptized or not, (so far at least as their religious state is concerned,) is considered of no avail; until, some time during life, they shall become subjects of the "new birth;"—converted by a sudden "change of heart," of which they have a distinct consciousness, and in which they are entirely passive. Though in reading the Scriptures, baptized persons are represented as members of the "family" and "household" of Christ; as "fellow citizens with the saints;" as "members of Christ," "children of God," and "heirs of the kingdom of heaven;" as having "put on Christ" by baptism; and as being "buried with him in baptism;"* yet these are all regarded by those who are imbued with the New Theology, as mere figurative modes of expression, from which they derive no distinct conception of the real efficacy of the sacrament. The great idea of the "*new heart*" swallows up all concern for the sacramental and ordinary means of grace; and regarding all human efforts as of no avail in effecting this consummation, their hopes or their despair, depend solely on the *sovereign grace of God.* They seem to have no just conception of the nature of that visible, though spiritual kingdom, which Christ came to establish upon earth, as the means of our preparation for heaven;—a kingdom designed for effecting a union between God and man through the medium of the incarnate Son of God; and that the sacrament of baptism has been instituted for the special purpose of admitting men into this kingdom, and to a participation in all the means of sanctification and salvation which pertain to it.

Brethren, if the influence of such sentiments shall be found yet to linger in the minds of any members of our Church, let them be assured that they have their origin in metaphysical subtilties, or the "traditions of men;" and not in the simplicity of the Scriptures nor the language of our Prayer Book. Let them be assured that those who are sacramentally baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, become by that act, (not in name only, but in deed and in truth,) "members of Christ," "children of God," and "heirs of the kingdom of heaven;" that by the renunciation of the dominion of Satan, and their adoption into the kingdom of Christ, they are restored to a state of favor with God, and brought within the sphere of the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. And this is not to be regarded as a mere temporary act, but as the initiation into an abiding state. On this ground, the apostles exhorted their baptized converts to count themselves "dead unto sin, and alive unto God;" and on this ground it is that all baptized persons, at the present day, may be encouraged to address their prayers to their Father in heaven, in the confidence of a gracious audience; that they may be exhorted to confess to him their daily transgressions, and to supplicate his divine forgiveness; and that they may pray to be renewed, day by day, in the spirit of their minds, through the covenanted aids of the Holy Ghost.

It is on this sure ground, too, that parents may be encouraged to bring up their children, "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." They should raise their own minds to the high and gracious relationship in which their children are placed; and the first sentiment impressed upon their youthful hearts should be, that they are in very deed, "Children of God." As they increase in stature and in wisdom, and become capable of comprehending so high a mystery, they should be made to understand that, in the sacrament of baptism, they received "the spirit of adoption," by which they are enabled to address God as their Father, to regard Christ as their Brother, as well as Redeemer, and the Holy Ghost as their indwelling companion and Sanctifier. They should be taught to regard their bodies as temples of God; that the Spirit of God dwelleth in them, and is ever ready to guide, quicken, and assist them, in their duties; unless, through their own depravity, and perseverance in sin, they obstinately resist, or quench, or grieve away the heavenly Guest.

My brethren;—God, in his Word, has revealed to us sublime ideas of the nature and import of this Holy Sacrament.

Let us never be guilty of degrading them, by regarding it as a mere ceremony, a fiction, a solemn mockery, of no practical use or efficacy! Rather let us strive to be duly sensible of our own high privileges as children of God, as well as ministers of Christ, and of the awful responsibilities which these relationships impose on us.

It had been my purpose to address to you a few remarks on the subject of the Lord's Supper, and the errors which prevail in regard to the nature and import of this Holy Sacrament; but I have already encroached so much upon your time, that I must hasten to a conclusion.

Brethren, I am aware that the plainness of speech which has characterized this discourse, will bring upon me the imputation of uncharitableness, by those who dissent from my opinions. I am not conscious of any such feeling, and it has been my desire to express myself with proper Christian courtesy. But charity consists not in the suppression of important truths, nor in overlooking important errors. It is sufficient that we entertain kindly feeling towards those whom we believe to be in error, and adhere to the great law of equity, by doing to others as we would have them do to us. The views which I have presented in relation to the right of private judgment in matters of religion, in regard to the nature and constitution of the Christian Church, its ministry and sacraments, are widely different from the opinions held by many wise and good men around us. I question not their intelligence, or their piety. I would judge no man. I would unchurch no man. I would decide nothing concerning the *efficacy* of a ministry which I may deem to be invalid, nor concerning the *benefits* which may be attendant on irregular or defective ministrations. It is the prerogative of God alone, who knows what allowance may be made for ignorance, pride, or prejudice, to determine what shall be the *consequences* to any man, of the errors he commits,—whether those errors be voluntary, or involuntary. But, my brethren, it is the duty of all men to seek the truth, and to maintain it. And, for ourselves, it has been made our special care "with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's Word." Errors in religion, whether they relate to the theory or to the practice of it, are not only hazardous to those who embrace them, but they are injurious to the cause of religion itself. All the writings of Infidels have, perhaps, done less to injure the cause of Christianity, than the heresies and schisms which have rent the Church, the multiplicity of sects which have arisen, and the hatred, the fanaticism, and the extravagances by which they have been attended.

In the midst of all these evils, the sure word of God is our only refuge; the true Church of God is our only ark of safety. The Word of God, and the Church of God, as they were understood in the earlier and purer ages of Christianity; as they were interpreted by the Reformers of the Church of England; and as the spirit of both is embodied in our Book of Common Prayer. The thousand systems of doctrine, devised by the subtilty of metaphysicians, the thousand religious schemes emanating from the fancies of zealots, have vanished, or are rapidly passing away. The Prayer Book has stood the scrutiny of ages. It is the safe bulwark, erected under the Providence of God, and sustained by his goodness, against the disorganization and fanaticism of sects, on the one hand, and against the tyranny and superstition of Romanism on the other. Its doctrines have received the sanction of the true Catholic Church, from the time of the apostles; its prayers have been used and hallowed by a long line of saints and martyrs; and it now stands secure, as the only enduring monument of the Protestant Reformation.

* Luther regarded baptismal regeneration as the true ground of Justification by Faith. "Believe on the warrant of your baptism," says he. "You are grafted into Christ; claim your position. You have the Spirit, you are children of God; do not live as if you belonged to the devil." This was his invariable language: with *this* he shook the Seven Hills.—*Maurice's Kingdom of Christ*, p. 255.

From the English Journal of Education for June.

NOTICE OF THE LATE S. F. WOOD, ESQ.

The present number of this journal cannot go forth without some allusion to the recent death of one of the most diligent laborers in the cause of Christian education. He is known to our readers as the author of two articles, "On Attaching the Middle and Lower Orders to the Church," which appeared in this journal with the signature of S. F. W. The initials are those of the late Samuel Francis Wood, M. A., of Oriel, Oxford, and Barrister at Law. It must be noticed here, with peculiar interest, that the last of those papers was one of his latest compositions. Just before it appeared in our April number, he had retired to the seat of his father, Sir Francis Wood, Bart., of Hickleton, in Yorkshire, where he passed into rest on Saturday, the 22d of April, after two years of slowly wasting health and strength.

It is not in the pages of a magazine that the memory of what we must venture to call his saintly character, can be fitly preserved. Something in the way of silence is due to that unaffected reserve, wherewith he seemed to withdraw himself from observation, and to be wounded by praise. Yet something in the way of utterance is due to the friends who loved him, and to the Church which reaped the fruit of his willing service. Even here, therefore, without trenching on the province and privilege of near and dear friends, who, we trust, will speak of his more private life for the instruction of others, it may not be presumptuous to note down a few particulars of those good works, the unwearied discharge of which, even to the last, causes him to be missed in so many quarters.

During his college life he was, as he has been ever since, an example to many. He was formed to make and retain friendships of no common warmth, by animated kindness of manner, affectionate and tender sympathy, and an unvarying charity of judgment which was most remarkable. He took his degree in May, 1831, and was in the first class in classics, a distinction which he fully deserved, by an unusual union of elegant scholarship, historical knowledge, and philosophical thought, with a sound and discriminating judgment. He was always remarkable for accuracy of knowledge and independence of mind, as well as for the freshness of interest with which he apprehended the merits of the different schools of literature to which this century has given birth, both at home and abroad.

With these qualities, so given by nature, so improved by cultivation, and sanctified by purity of intention and deep devotion, it is not surprising that he took a vivid interest in the struggle which these times have witnessed for the maintenance of ancient principles and the restoration of life to the institutions of the Church. With clearness of intellect to apprehend distinctly the points at issue, and with that earnestness of heart which gives one man power over others, he exercised an important influence, though with such retiring modesty, that he seemed himself unconscious of it; yet sometimes by his pen, sometimes by his counsel, and at all times by the example of his meekness, and by the sweetness of his society, he drew men on to holy thoughts, and to deeper views of what was passing around them.

In this place, however, we must speak of him only in one point of view, namely, in reference to the service rendered by him to the various societies which in our day supply, in some measure, the lack of a more adequate ecclesiastical organization. He was early called to this work by gaining the confidence of that revered layman, whose retirement from the treasurership of the National Society was so affectionately commemorated at the last annual meeting. As that venerable person seemed to perform the part of Robert Nelson in this century, so did he of whom we are writing seem destined one day to follow in the same track; indeed, he once was heard to observe, that it seemed as if he was called to take up the routine of the work of his aged friend; and, therefore, though few were more painfully alive to the faults of our religious societies, or longed more earnestly for deeper principles of united action, he was content, day by day, to do the good which seemed appointed to be done in his time by means of the existing machinery. Accordingly, he would spend many a patient hour, even during exhausting illness, in sifting applications for aid, whether for the building of churches or of schools, or for the employment of additional clergy.

In the various committees of which he was a member, he was ever diligent in his attendance to the ordinary routine of business, as well as ready to devise plans of extended utility; there was no one more clear-sighted to discern what was practicable from what was fanciful, no one more fertile in expedients to reconcile conflicting opinions, and to bring various minds to bear on the execution of the common object. In all his communications there was a peculiar suavity of manner, a consideration for the feelings of others; and, especially, in his dealings with those in authority or in advanced life, there was an unaffected deference and delicacy of manner, which cannot easily be forgotten.

He was among the first promoters of the extended diocesan operations engrafted on the parent stock of the National Society, and, in the operations of the committee of inquiry and correspondence, his was the [illegible] pen to sketch some of the most important documents; his the zeal and the discretion which commended the plans proposed to the judgment of those on whom their adoption depended.

In how many ways he advanced the cause of education both in London and in the country, cannot now be told; but it may be interesting to an important, and we hope a numerous class of the readers of this journal to know, that they are in a great measure indebted to him for the arrangements by which the comfort and improvement of the adult masters in training at Westminster, have been provided for. The rising institution at Stanley Grove also engaged his peculiar interest and watchful care. It owes to his happy suggestion the name of St. Mark's College, which so well indicates the true position of the schoolmaster in the Church.*

He had taken particular interest in the erection and adorning of the chapel, to which he gave a window of stained glass; but he was not permitted to live till divine service was performed within its walls. He was, however, fresh in the memory of the friends who there knelt together on the third Sunday after Easter, but one week after his funeral; and along with his name, doubtless, were remembered those of W. M. Praed and H. N. Coleridge, fellow workers in the same cause—like him accomplished in mind and gentle in spirit, and like him called hence in the prime of life.

May the remembrance of such animate the hearts of those who remain, that they slacken not in the work to which they stand pledged: and may God in His mercy increase the number of those who labor in his Church, and grant them a like spirit of patience, humility, and perseverance!

* "Barnabas and Saul . . . took with them John, whose surname was Mark." Acts xii. 25. "So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed . . . and . . . preached the word of God . . . and they had also John to their minister." Acts xiii. 4, 5.

CHURCHMAN'S BOOKSTORE.

JAMES A. SPARKS,
OFFICE OF THE CHURCHMAN,
No. 109 NASSAU-STREET, NEW YORK,
(UP STAIRS.)

Orders enclosing cash, for any book to be had in this city, promptly attended to.

CHURCH MUSIC,

Adapted to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and others using Chants.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED,

Gregorian and other Ecclesiastical Chants,
Adapted to the Psalter and Canticles, as they are pointed to be sung in churches. From the 2d London edition. This work contains: 1. The eight Gregorian Tones, with their several endings; 2. A variety of the same tones harmonized for four voices, but so as to preserve unaltered the original melodies; 3. Miscellaneous Chants; 4. The Versicles and Responses, from Tallis's Cathedral Service. To which are added, Kyrie Eleison, Sanctus, and Responses to the Decalogue. Price 50 cents.

The Canticles of the Church;
Being portions of the services which may be "*said or sung,*"—pointed and arranged in *bars* corresponding with the music to which they may be sung. The design of this work is to enable the congregation to unite with the Choir in performing this part of the service

Te Deum and Jubilate (in A),
By Wm. Boyce, Mus. Doc. Circ. 1760. With an easy arrangement for the Organ and Piano Forte, by Edward Hodges, Mus. Doc., Director of the Music of Trinity Parish, New York. This work contains 18 quarto pages, with an engraved title page, suitable in form to bind with other music. Price 75 cents. The attention of the friends of Church Music of the *highest order* is respectfully solicited to this work.

Music of the Church, (with a Supplement,)
A Collection of Psalm, Hymn, and Chant Tunes, adapted to the worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. By the Rev. Dr. Wainwright. 7th edition. Price 87½ cents.

A New Gloria in Excelsis.
A Gloria in Excelsis, with an easy arrangement for the Organ and Piano Forte, by "A Contributor to Church Music."

The Psalter, or Psalms of David, &c.
POINTED FOR CHANTING.
Compiled from the Arrangements of Robert Janes and James Stimpson; to which are appended, *The Burial of the Dead, Athanasian Creed, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittus, Sentences of the Offertory at the Holy Communion, Table of Introits for every Sunday and Holy Day throughout the Year, Table for Chanting the Selection of Psalms, A Note stating how the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds and Lord's Prayer may be chanted, and the Canticles of the Church.* Price 75 cents.

An Essay on the Cultivation of Church Music. By Edward Hodges, Esq., Mus. Doct., late of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge, England. Pp. 24. Price 18¾ cents.

March and Chorus; from Hannah More's Sacred Drama of David and Goliath. By B. Wyman.—Price 25 cents.

The Church Choir, Parts First and Second. By the Rev. Mr. Muenscher. Price $1. The Second Part consists of Chants, Anthems, and Sentences. Price 62½ cents.

The Chants of the Church. By Messrs. Darley & Standbridge. Price 75 cents.

Loud's Organ Study: A thorough System of Instruction on the Organ. Price $5.

Gems of Sacred Music: Consisting of eleven Introductory Sentences, and one Funeral Anthem for four voices; with an accompaniment for the Piano Forte or Organ. Selected from the best composers, and arranged by J. C. B. Standbridge, Organist of Christ Church, Philadelphia. Price 75 cents.

Standbridge's Piano Forte Instruction. Price $3.

☞ A liberal discount made to Choirs and wholesale dealers.

J. A. S. has just published a second edition of
PLAIN SERMONS. By Contributors to the Tracts for the Times. 2 vols. Price $1 50. The publisher will venture to say, that no religiously disposed person can attentively read these Sermons without being profited thereby.

The following is from the Bishop of New York:

RECOMMENDATION.

"These volumes of '*Plain Sermons*' appear to me to be admirably adapted to the conveying of religious instruction on the sound principles of the Gospel, and are therefore recommended to the members of my diocese, for private and family reading. I also hereby authorize the public reading of them, together with such others as I may from time to time appoint, by lay-readers within said diocese.

Benjamin T. Onderdonk,
Bishop of the Diocese of New York.
New York, June 14, 1841.

PRAYER BOOKS.
Quarto Prayers, suitable for Reading Desks, bound; and also in sheets, which can be bound to order.

NEWMAN'S PAROCHIAL SERMONS.
This valuable work is now published, and for sale at this office.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST,
By Rev. F. D. Maurice, A. M., from the 2d London edition. For sale at this office, price $2 50.

PATRICK, LOWTH AND WHITBY,
A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha, by *Patrick, Lowth, Arnald, Whitby*, and *Lowman*. A new edition, with the *Text printed at large*, in 4 vols. (London edition.) Price $25.

WORKS ON EPISCOPACY.
Bowden and Cook. Also, Dr. Cook's Answer to the Princeton Review. For sale at this office.

BERNARD LESLIE.
Just published, Bernard Leslie, or a Tale of the Last Ten Years. By the Rev. W. Gresley, A. M. From the second London edition.

A TREATISE ON BAPTISM,
By the late Rev. Alexander Hay, of Virginia; with letters commendatory from Rt. Rev. Bishop Chase, and the Rev. Dr. Shelton; and a Sketch of the Life of the Author, by the Rev. C. Dresser. Price 37½ cts.
June 17.

BROOKLYN COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE,
An English and Classical Boarding School,
Washington Avenue, Brooklyn.

THE Rev. JACOB W. DILLER having accepted a call to the rectorship of St. Luke's Church, on Clinton Avenue, has associated himself with Mr. Young in the discharge of the various duties of this institution.—Mr. Diller was for many years associated with the Rev. Dr. Muhlenburg in his celebrated institution at Flushing, in which he established a reputation as a highly talented and successful teacher. To persons consulting the health and happiness, the literary, moral and religious improvement of their sons or wards, this school offers inducements excelled perhaps by none.

Terms, including every expense except bed and bedding, books and stationery, from $160 to $200 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.

The Summer term commences on Monday the 2d of May. Catalogues of the pupils and patrons may be had at the office of the Churchman, No. 111 Nassau street, or at the Institute.

References.—The Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, and the Episcopal clergy of Brooklyn generally.

All letters addressed to John Young, Brooklyn, will meet with prompt attention. June 25.

PARISH LIBRARY, 13 vols—viz:
VOL. 1, Leslie and West.
Vol. 2, Sumner on Preaching.
Vol. 3, Jewell's Apology.
4, Clement's Epistles.
5, Gibson's Letters.
6, Sherlock's Discourses.
7, Sumner on Matthew and Mark.
8, and 9, Works on Episcopacy.
10, Jebb's Kempis.
11, Walton's Lives.
12, Burnett's Lives.
13, Sumner on St. Luke. Fresh bound in cloth, $8.
J. A. SPARKS,
Churchman's Bookstore,
May 27. 109 Nassau-street.

☞ JOHN MORISON, Sexton in the Parish of Trinity Church, and Undertaker, having been appointed by the Corporation of Trinity Church, Superintendent of Funerals and Interments in the ground belonging to them, all applications for interments in their ground must be made to him from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. at the Trinity Church Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church sts, and at other hours at his house, No. 17 Clarkson st, near Hudson st. He will find all articles requisite for funerals on reasonable terms, and give punctual attendance. Dec 11—yly

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY THE
GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,
Depository, No. 20 John Street, New York.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer, per hundred,		$3 00
Prot Epis S S Book, No. 1, per hundred,		1 38
" " " 2,	"	1 75
" " " 3,	"	2 00
" " " 4,	"	5 00
Questions on the S S Books.	"	5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism, per hun.		1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,)	"	5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	3 00
Church Catechism,	"	1 25
First Truths,	"	2 50
Duty to God,	"	0 50
Church Primer,	"	1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 75
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	20 00
" " Vol. 2, New do	"	22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	"	2 50

A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.
The Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Library 76 vols. 18mo.—nett price 20 cents each.
The same, bound in 1.9 volumes of various prices.—Total, $18 91 nett.
The Children's Magazine, bound in 28 volumes of 141 pages each, price for the set, $5 80 nett.
The Juvenile Library, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.
Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to
Daniel Dana, Jr., Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John st.
New York, March 18, 1843.

THE CHURCHMAN,
EDITED BY
THE REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.,
And under the General Direction and Supervision of
The Bishop of the Diocese of New York,
of whom it is the Official Organ of Communication with his Diocese,
It is published every Saturday for the proprietors, by
JAMES A. SPARKS,
109 Nassau-street, New York, *up stairs.*

Its object is to disseminate religious intelligence, elucidate Christian doctrine, and explain and enforce the principles and precepts of evangelical piety.

For the proper and more effectual accomplishment of these objects, it is, as it ever has been, since its establishment in 1831, devoted to the interests, in every department, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to this end sets forth, elucidates, and when necessary defends, those principles and that policy, which have ever characterized the Diocese of New York, and by the divine blessing on which that Diocese has been enabled to maintain so much efficiency in promoting

"The united interests of the Gospel and the Church."

Communications intended for insertion should be addressed to the *Editor*, and letters on business to the *Publisher.*

Terms. *Three dollars* per annum, payable in advance. No subscription received for less than six months; and none discontinued until arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietor.

AGENTS.

Rev. Charles Burroughs, D.D., George M. Marsh,	Portsmouth, N.H.
Charles Stimpson,	Boston, Mass.
Samuel R. Slack,	East Cambridge, "
Burnett & Blodget,	Providence, R. I.
David Le Favour,	Pawtucket, "
G. G. Smith,	St. Albans, Vt.
Rev. Josiah Perry,	Brandon, "
Croswell & Jewett, Booksellers,	New Haven, "
Henry S. Parsons,	Hartford, "
W. C. Little, Esq.	Albany, N. Y.
Charles B. Pinckney,	Catskill, "
Stephen P. Nash, Esq.	Saratoga Springs, "
A. A. Van Voorst,	Schenectady, "
Young & Hart,	Troy, "
Alexander Walsh, Esq (gratis)	Lansingburgh, "
Ebenezer C. Arnold,	Poughkeepsie, "
William Purdy,	Newburgh, "
Thomas C. Miller,	Auburn, "
Dr. A. F. Dodge,	Geneva, "
Isaiah Tiffany,	Utica, "
J. F. Hutchinson, Esq. P. M.	Watertown, "
A. B. Watson,	Unadilla, "
Henry Adriance,	Oswego, "
H. N. Walker,	Buffalo, "
D. L. Farnam, Esq.	Fayetteville, "
R. S. H. George, Bookseller, 26 South Fifth street,	Philadelphia
H. J. Terry, Esq.,	Newcastle, Del
Knight & Colburn,	Baltimore, Md
J. Biscoe, Post Office,	Chaptico, "
Wm. W. Johnston, Esq., P. M.	Princess Ann, "
Bell & Entwistle,	Alexandria, D. C.
George Rowland Esq.	Norfolk, Va.
Joseph Gill,	Richmond, "
A. A. Brown, Esq.	Wilmingon, N. C.
A. E. Miller,	Charleston, S. C
G. McLaughlin,	Augusta, Ga.
Solomon K. Grant,	Louisville, Ky.
William Jucho,	Lexington, "
Arius Nye,	Marietta, Ohio
Lewis Handerson,	Cleveland, "
Henry H. Hoffman, Post Office,	Quincy, Ill.
P. E. Demill, Esq.	Jackson, Michigan
Rev. E. O. Hodgkin,	Homer, "
David H. Armstrong,	St. Louis Mo.
Brevoort Butler,	Natchez, Mis.

THE CHURCHMAN EXTRA.

PUBLISHED BY JAMES A. SPARKS,] NEW YORK: AUGUST 1, 1843. [No. 109 NASSAU-STREET.

THE ORDINATION OF MR. CAREY.

We said in our last, that Bishop Onderdonk would not want for assailants; and so the event has proved. The two doctors, to escape the indignation of the Church at their disorderly and contumacious conduct towards their bishop, have made an appeal to the public, and, by a one-sided statement of facts, have endeavored to turn upon their bishop the cloud which was ready to break upon their own heads.

Of course they have been partially successful. Let any two professional men, on a distinctively professional subject, appeal against their brethren to the passions and prejudices of the people, and they will gain an ephemeral applause for themselves, and bring a transient shadow of obloquy upon their profession. Nothing easier to be done, and nothing surer to be followed by disgrace to the recreants. We do not mean merely that such men will forfeit the respect and confidence of their brethren—that of course—but we mean that they will forfeit the respect and confidence of the people; for the people, though on professional subjects, especially if they pertain to theology, easily misled, are sure to come right in the end. They need only to have the truth fairly brought before them in order to come, surely how slowly soever, to a sound decision.

We agreed entirely with our brethren of the Committee that it was desirable, if possible, to spare Drs Anthon and Smith the disgrace of a full exposure of their misrepresentations; and in this view we cheerfully coincided with them in a brief and solemn declaration that the pamphlet put forth by these gentlemen was not adapted to convey the full and fair impression produced on our minds by Mr. Carey's examination, but that it was adapted to mislead the public mind, and to do injustice to all the parties concerned in the examination and subsequent ordination. Every member of the Committee who united in this declaration, felt and acknowledged that it was utterly inadequate to express his sense of the unfairness of the "Statement" of the two doctors; but all agreed that it was best to say no more to their disparagement than was necessary, and that enough was said to impair the credit of their statement, and to show that it was a one-sided affair which no candid mind should trust to guide it to a fair conclusion. And there we would gladly have left the matter, in hopes that the laity of the Church would have had sufficient confidence in their bishop to abide by his judgment. Nor if the minds of our laity had been left to their own spontaneous operation, should we have been disappointed.—"Laicus," and "Robert Court," in our last, spoke their sentiments, and proved that a pamphlet, which to every intelligent Churchman carried its own refutation, would have had not the weight of a feather in opposition to the solemn and deliberate judgment of the Bishop of the Diocese. But it has long been the misfortune, the reproach, and the fault of the Churchmen of this city—one which we know they have long felt and lamented, and which it is now time for them to remedy,—that there is no daily paper in this city conducted on principles congenial to their Church; none which exercises even a neutral influence in their favor; none which is not often positively and gratuitously offensive to their holy faith; none even of those whose editors are professedly Churchmen, (as the events of the last week have proved,) which is not ready, without reasonable cause, without an appearance of cause sufficient to weigh with any intelligent and well-principled Churchman, to turn upon their bishop and their Church, and seek to cover both with odium and insult. It is to these journals, which affect to deprecate Church controversies, and yet in the same breath have the effrontery to charge the bishop of this diocese, and five at least of his most respected presbyters, with an attempt to "undermine" their Church, and to say that they ought to be separated from her communion—and whose ignorant declamation has of course had its effect, that the Church is to thank for an exposure of the misstatements of Drs. Anthon and Smith, which we, for our part, would most gladly have spared them.

Besides an unwillingness to expose the authors of the "Statement," there was another consideration which weighed strongly with our own mind, and yet more strongly with other members of the Committee; and that is, that the proceedings of the Committee of Examination were of a confidential nature, and could not be spread before the public without a betrayal of confidence. If the editor had felt, as he certainly did not feel, the least wish to retort the unjust and offensive imputations made in the "Statement" upon himself personally, he would still have felt that his lips were sealed; and that however much the two doctors might have deserved to be exposed, a sense of honor required him to be silent. And such, but for the course of the daily press, would have been our conduct; we should have suffered in silence. But if Public Opinion, to which in a matter of this nature we ought not to be held responsible, will persist in dragging us before its tribunal, and in visiting the penalty of our silence not on our own head, but on the Church, why then say we, let Public Opinion have our evidence; and accordingly we proceed to give it as we would in a court of justice, regardless of whom or where it hits, and leaving it for judge and jury to make what use of it they please.

To expose all the misstatements of the pamphlet, in one number of our paper, is impossible; we shall, therefore, at present confine ourselves to those leading ones by which the public have been chiefly abused: and in doing so, we shall drop for a few moments the usual editorial style, and adopt another more suited to our purpose, and which will enable us at once both to give our own testimony, and to make comments on the "Statement."

"The following was the question proposed:

Q. 1. 'Supposing entrance into the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country were not open to you, would you, or would you not, have recourse, in such case, to the ministry of the Church of Rome?'

Answer. 'Possibly I might, after due deliberation, but think that I should more likely remain in our own communion, as I have no special leaning towards the joining of theirs at present.'

Dr. Seabury having objected to this question being put, and having advised the examined not to answer, the right thus to advise was questioned by us, as preventing our arriving at a knowledge of the sentiments actually held by Mr. Carey, and thus defeating the very object of the examination. The bishop decided that the candidate might be advised by any one presbyter whom he might select. Dr. Smith then asked of the bishop whether the examined was to be allowed the benefit of counsel. The bishop did not recede from his decision. Exception was taken to the decision, as sanctioning a mode wholly unprecedented; but the exception was not strongly pressed by us."*

It is true that I objected to the question, and I did so on the ground of its being a hypothetical question, and as such, a trap to the conscience. I objected gravely, and to illustrate my meaning related the case of a young man who, while under examination for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, was asked by a clergyman who desired to defeat his ordination, whether he were willing, if GOD should call him thereto, to renounce home, and family, and all that he held dear on earth, and go on a mission to the wilds of Siberia, or some like spot. Gentlemen, said the Moderator, it will be time enough for the young man to answer that question when he *is* called to such mission. Dr. M'Vickar remarked, that they might as well ask Mr. C. whether if he had lived in the time of the patriarchs he would have married two wives! I supposed—and it seems I was right—that the mode of examination on the part of the two doctors was adopted with a view to publication, and I thought the question one from which the candidate on many accounts ought to have been shielded by the bishop. Mr. Carey, however, expressed a desire to answer; and he did answer. He said that the case supposed would be a painful one; that he did not know what he should do; that certainly he should come to no hasty decision on so grave a matter; that he should *spend two or three years at least* in deliberating on the subject; that at the expiration of that time he possibly might seek admission to the ministry in the Church of Rome; but that he thought it more probable he should remain a layman in his own Church, since he was satisfied with it, was attached to it, and had no disposition to leave it. The two doctors, however, insisting on a categorical answer, or the nearest to it that might be, Mr. Carey replied:

"Possibly I might, after due deliberation, but think that I should more likely remain A LAYMAN in our own communion, as I have no special leaning towards theirs at present."

The "Statement" omits the words "a layman," which it may be said are implied in what goes before, but which need to be emphasized in order to convey an idea of the sacrifice which a young man would make whose affections and education had been for years directed to the ministry.

I stop not to ask what the two doctors themselves would have done had they lived before the Reformation, or what, according to the hypothesis, they would do now; whether they would forego their inward call to the ministry, or take to preaching under the flag of Wesley; but proceed.

I may here notice in passing, a ludicrous blunder in the "Statement," and one so beside every thing in the way of reasonable probability, that in my first reading of the "Statement" I did not see it, and am indebted for the discovery of it to the N. Y. Observer. In that paper I saw it stated, that Dr. Seabury acted "as counsel" for Mr. Carey! This I thought was as near the mark as could be expected from the Observer; but what was my surprise on a second and more careful reading of the pamphlet, to find that it sustained the assertion of the Observer that Dr. S. was assigned, in the legal and technical sense of the term, as Mr. Carey's counsel! The two doctors gravely remarking in a note, that they think, on reflection, that they should then have entered "a direct protest" to the bishop's novel decision! The fact is, that after the bishop had decided that written answers might be taken from the candidate, knowing the ill use which might be made of the answers, and wishing as far as might be to shield Mr. Carey from the misrepresentations to which he would be exposed, I asked the bishop whether it would be competent for the presbyters to advise Mr. C. on the propriety or impropriety of answering the questions which might be put to him. He answered, certainly, that the candidate might be so advised by any presbyter. But the idea that I was to act as Mr. Carey's counsel, (as if the two doctors were his accusers,) never entered my mind; and although I have not since exchanged a word with the bishop or any member of the Committee on this point, I shall certainly be much surprised to learn that the idea was not equally droll to them.

"Dr. Smith then proposed question 2 in the following words:

Q. 2. 'Do you hold to, and receive the decrees of the Council of Trent?'

His answer was, 'I do not deny that the decrees of the Council—"

Mr. Carey had proceeded thus far in his reply, when, at the request of Drs. Seabury, Berrian, M'Vickar, and Mr. Haight, he declined repeating the words next in order, as Dr. Anthon desired, so as to allow him time to take down the full answer: the advice being grounded upon the loss of time it would occasion to take down, in this manner, all the answers.

Dr. Smith here observed, 'Brethren, are we running a race against time? Are we not rather assembled to discharge a solemn duty to the Church, and not to consult our personal convenience? Ought we not to be willing, if necessary, to remain here till 12 o'clock to-night, and assemble again to-morrow, and remain the entire day, if needful, so as to come to a just conclusion?'

Mr. Carey finally expressed his willingness to repeat his answer to the question, which he did in the following words, which were taken down by Dr. Anthon.

Ans. 'I do not deny them—I would not positively affirm them.'"

A more unfair statatement than this I cannot imagine. For Mr. Carey expressly stated,—1. That he did not regard the Council of Trent as œcumenical, and of course that he held its peculiar definitions to be open points, and not of faith; 2. That in what he might say favorably of the decrees of Trent, he took the decrees in the mere letter, and not as interpreted by the Romish system, and the concurrent sense of the Roman divines; and 3. That he held the Roman Church responsible for the errors of her system, and the teaching of her doctors.

How the authors of the "Statement" can answer to their consciences, for having suppressed these and such like explanations with which Mr. Carey accompanied the categorical answer which they insisted on extracting from him, is for them to say.

It should be here remarked, that Mr. Carey said nothing of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and that all which he said left him free to condemn the practical abuses and corruptions of the Roman Church.

"*Q.* 3. 'Do you, or do you not, deem the differences between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of Rome to be such as embrace *points of faith?*'

To this Mr. Carey was *understood* to reply, 'If these differences be understood to be matters of doctrine, they would embrace points of faith; but if, as is believed, they are matters of opinion, they would not.'"

In a note to page 22 of the "Statement" it is said, "that Dr. Seabury several times, in the course of his examination, made suggestions to the candidate, and offered explanations of his, Mr. Carey's meaning." Here the two doctors have substituted inference for fact. The object of my questions was not to make suggestions to Mr. Carey; but it was, if possible, to pierce the minds of the two doctors with a sense of certain broad and palpable distinctions which they either could not or would not heed, but the apprehension of which was necessary to a just appreciation of Mr. Carey's views. A question which I put in connexion with their third question will illustrate my meaning. I asked Mr. Carey whether by the word *faith*, he meant the fundamental or essential faith, or all doctrine whatsoever which might be accounted true? He answered unhesitatingly, that by the word *faith* he meant the fundamental or essential faith. Now the fundamental or Catholic faith is common to the two Churches of England and Rome, and there is certainly no difference between them "in points of faith," taking the word *faith* in the theological sense to mean the doctrines which are summed up in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the differences between the two communions pertaining to the superstructure, and not to the foundation. Now it seemed to me, that in justice to Mr. Carey, and in justice to themselves, the two doctors should heed this distinction, and not drive Mr. Carey to a categorical answer, in which the word faith should be used by him in the Anglican sense, and taken by them and the public, (for I could not divest my mind of the impression that the notes of the two doctors would be published,) in the Ultra Protestant and Romish sense; both the Ultra Protestants and the Romanists taking the word *faith* to mean any and every doctrine which they believe to have come from GOD. The two doctors, however, either could not or would not see the difference; and the consequence is, that they have here put words into Mr. Carey's mouth which he never used, and which do him even more injustice as a man of sense than as a student of theology. They make him say, that "if these differences be understood to be matters of doctrine, they would embrace points of faith; but if, as is believed, they are matters of opinion, they would not;" an answer which may seem pregnant with heresy to the two doctors, and frightful to the public; but which seems to me mere jargon. Mr. Carey's answer, for substance, was, that the differences were more than matters of opinion; that they were grave doctrines, the truth of which he was not prepared either to deny or positively to affirm; but that on one thing he was clear, *viz.*, that they were not points of faith.

"*Q.* 4. 'Do you, or do you not, believe the doctrine of transubstantiation to be repugnant to Scripture, subversive of the nature of a sacrament, and giving occasion to superstition?'

'If you do not, how can you *ex animo* subscribe the 28th Article of our Standards?'

Mr. Carey prefaced his answer to this question by reading an extract from 'Taylor's Holy Living and Dying,' as expressive of his own views, which extract could not by us be taken down; and then more briefly gave his answer in the following words, recorded by Dr. Anthon, and acceded to by Mr. Carey.

Ans. "I would answer, in general language, that I do not hold *that* doctrine of transubstantiation which I suppose our Article condemns; but that, at the same time, I conceive myself at liberty to confess ignorance on the mode of the Presence.'"

The answer here given is correct, and my only wonder is, that it is not satisfactory. No Churchman, I should think, would object to the answer as it stands; certainly not in connexion with the extract from Bishop Taylor, which occurring in one of his devotional and most popular works, might have been easily obtained, had only a reference to it been given in the statement; and still less in connexion with the explanation which the two doctors might have added, that Mr. Carey affirms that the bread and wine remain after consecration, and that the senses are to be trusted in proof of the fact; in opposition to the Romanists, who call upon men in this matter to abjure their senses, and bow to the dogmas of faith.

"*Q.* 5. 'Do you, or do you not, regard the denial of the cup to the laity an unwarrantable change in a sacrament of Christ's own institution, or as to be regarded as a mere matter of discipline?'

Ans., taken down by Dr. Smith. 'I consider it an *unwarrantable* act of discipline;' Mr. Carey subsequently preferring to substitute the word '*severe*' instead of '*unwarrantable*.'"

T call the deprivation of the cup a severe act of discipline, is certainly a new proof of Popery.

"6. 'On which Church do you believe the sin of schism rests in consequence of the English Reformation?—the Church of England, and, by consequence, the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, or upon the Church of Rome?'

Dr. Seabury objected to this question being put, on the ground that it was an *historical* question. Mr. Carey, under advisement, answered, 'It is an historical question.'"

Dr. Smith here appealed to the bishop against this evasion of the question, on the grounds that this was the final examination to test the meetness of the candidate for Deacons' Orders, and that this final examination embraced, according to the canon, among other points, Church History, Ecclesiastical Polity, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Constitution and Canons of the Church, and of the diocese for which he is ordained; the examination on the Ritual, the Articles, and the Canons evidently and necessarily referring to the *historical* questions on their formation, changes, &c.

The bishop having decided that the question ought to be answered, Mr. Carey, in substance, replied, 'that in some respects schism rests on both sides.' 'He considered both churches in communion with the Church of Christ.'"

I might perhaps be pardoned for expressing the wish that the two doctors had been as anxious to relate Mr. Carey's explanations as Dr. Seabury's objections. It is true that I objected to the question, (the only question, by the by, except the first, to which I did object,) though I attached little importance to the objection. I might have replied to Dr. Smith that this was *not* "the final examination to test the meetness of the candidate for deacons' orders;" I might have reminded the Rev. Dr. that *that* examination had been passed by Mr. Carey; that at the conclusion of it, the bishop and presbyters who had conducted it had deemed it satisfactory; I might have urged that this was a *special* examination instituted to ascertain the candidates *doctrinal* fitness, and that his opinion on the historical question of the Reformation might possibly serve to convey to the public (for the conviction that the notes of the two doctors would come before the public was constantly present to my mind, and mainly contributed, as I believe, to impart to the examination the unprecedented aspect which it assumed) an impression injurious to the candidate and repugnant to truth; but, as I said, I attached little importance to the objection, and cheerfully acquiesced in the bishop's decision.

As was to be expected, the brief answer of Mr. Carey given by the two doctors (as they conceive) "in substance," has conveyed to the public a false impression "In some respects schism rests on both sides." Take the word *schism* to refer to the fact of division, and the answer is true, and expresses Mr. Carey's meaning; take the word schism to denote the formal act of separation, and the answer is false, and does not express Mr. Carey's meaning. There is a schism between the Church of England and the Methodists; so that it may be said (in view of the mutual faults of both parties) that "in some respects schism rests on both sides;" but does this imply the belief that the formal act of schism is ours and not theirs; that we cut them off from our communion, and not that they separated from us? Now Mr. Carey expressly stated, that when in the only expression which (out of many others of an explanatory kind, that are omitted in the Statement) the two doctors have seen fit to note down, he said that schism rested on both sides, he took the word schism in its large sense as referring to the fact of separation. Why was this explanation withheld? Mr. Carey most unquestionably holds the formal act of schism to be the act of the Church of Rome, and not the act of the Church of England; and his answers left that impression distinct on my mind.

"*Q.* 7. 'Is the Romish doctrine of Purgatory in any respects maintained by our Standards?'

The bishop here asked Dr. Anthon what view *he* entertained on the doctrine of Purgatory, as held by the Church of Rome; to which Dr. Anthon replied, 'that, with due respect to the chair, *he* was not under examination.' The question being then addressed to Mr. Carey, he was understood to say, in reply, 'that he considered our Standards as condemning the doctrine *popularly* held to be the Roman doctrine.'"

It was, I believe, on another occasion, that the bishop put the question to Dr. Anthon which drew from the latter the truly Protestant reply, that "with due respect to the chair, *he* was not under examination;" for I am confident that I put to Dr. Anthon the question which he here attributes to the bishop; and which the bishop may also have asked; and I put it with a friendly intention: for knowing the manifold senses in which the word *purgatory* is used, I wished the word so explained that the candidate might address his answer to the precise idea intended to be conveyed by the question of the examiner. In reply I was desired, I will not say petulantly, but unexpectedly, to address my question to the candidate under examination. Profiting by this hint, I then asked Mr. Carey whether he believed that the faithful departed, during the intermediate state, were subjected to poenal suffering, or exposed to the vindictive justice of God? Mr. C. answered promptly in the negative. Now this question brings to view the distinctive Romish error; the whole system of indulgences and of prayers for the dead, as actually practised in the Roman communion, being founded on the notion, of which no mention is made by the Council of Trent, but which is defined by the Council of Florence, and made to be *of faith* by the Creed of Pius IV., that the faithful departed are subjected in the intermediate state to poenal sufferings, and required thereby to satisfy divine justice for the sins of which they failed to repent in life. Of this and much more of a like explanatory nature which was said by Mr. Carey on this point, there is no vestige in the "Statement."

"*Q.* 8. 'Is there any countenance given in the doctrinal Standards of our Church for the idea that the departed can be benefitted by the prayers of the faithful, or by the administration of the Holy Communion? And is not *that* idea condemned by Article 31 of our Church?'

As far as Mr. Carey's answer could be ascertained, it was to this effect: 'that he supposed that idea was not condemned in that Article; his opinion being, that the language of the Article was popular language, pointed at a popular opinion which was held against the Church of Rome.'"

I can readily conceive that the two doctors might have thought the error, which really lies at the bottom of all the Romish abuses on the subject of Purgatory, to be no more than a fancy of "the subtle polemic;" but how they or any other creature, human or inhuman, on the earth or under the earth, could ever have dreamed of the departed being "benefited by the administration of the holy communion," passes all comprehension. Sorry indeed am I, that two clergymen could be found so little careful of their reputation as to frame, propound, and publish such a question to the world. The Eucharist is a sacrifice of prayer as well as a sacrament of communion; and as the two doctors apparently meant to draw a distinction between prayer and the sacrifice in the Eucharist, I suppose that what they wished to get at was, whether the latter was in itself (i. e., apart from the sacrifice of CHRIST which it commemorates) propitiatory for the sins of the departed. If they had put this question, Mr. Carey would have answered them, as he answered me, in the negative. In simply expressing the belief, however, that the faithful departed are benefited by the prayers of their brethren on earth, and that this doctrine is not contradicted by our Articles, Mr. Carey follows the sense of many of the best divines of the Anglican Church, and our own. Take, for instance, the following prayer contained in the Christian's Manual, edited by the late Bishop Hobart:

"And grant that we may all find mercy and favor with all Thy saints, who, from the beginning of the world, have pleased thee in their several generations, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and every just Spirit made perfect in the faith of thy CHRIST, from righteous Abel, even unto this day: do Thou give *them and us rest* in the region of the living, in the bosoms of our Holy Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whence sorrow and grief and lamentation are banished away, where the light of Thy Countenance visits and shines continually; and vouchsafe to *bring them and us* to the full enjoyment of Thy Heavenly Kingdom."

These words are found in "An act of Intercession, from the ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem," to be used on Friday evening in every week. The prayer comprehending both *rest* to the faithful departed, and *increase of happiness*, covers the whole of Mr. Carey's view on the subject.

"*Q.* 9. 'Do you, or do you not fault the Church of Rome in pronouncing, as she does, the Books Apocryphal Holy Scripture?'

Ans. 'I do not, either to myself or any one else, attempt to prove a doctrine out of the Apocrypha.' 'The Holy Spirit may have spoken by the Apocrypha, and the Homily asserts the same thing.' The question was here renewed, and pressed in several different shapes by the bishop. The answer elicited by his last question was to the following effect: 'I would not fault the Church of Rome for reading the *Apocrypha* for proof of doctrine.'"

The account of the answer to this question is as near the truth as could be expected from two doctors who talk about the departed being "benefited by the administration of the "Holy Communion." Mr. Carey did not say that he did not fault the Church of Rome for attempting "to prove a doctrine out of the Apocrypha." His words were, that "he did not fault the Church of Rome for reading the Apocrypha, and considering it, in a loose sense, Scripture." It is true that Mr. Carey did express the belief that "the Holy Spirit may have spoken by the Apocrypha;" and it is true that the bishop did renew the question, and skilfully elicit from Mr. Carey several quotations from the Homilies, in which the same thing is asserted; but his object was, as it seemed to me, tacitly to caution the two doctors not to run their heads against the Homilies of their Church in their zeal to trip up Mr. Carey.

To a man who knows any thing of the subject, the very question of the two doctors shows misapprehension and mistiness: "Do you or do you not fault the Church of Rome in pronouncing, as she does, the Books Apocryphal, Holy Scripture?" Pray who of us can fault the Romanists for this, seeing our own Church does the same, and prescribes the Books Apocryphal to be "read" in her services "for example of life and instruction of manners." Mr. Carey, with an ingenuousness which has been but ill requited, addressed his answer to what would have been a test question, paying no heed to the unmeaning question of his examiners. He said, almost in the words of our sixth article, that he did not rely on the Apocryphal books for proof of doctrine; and though I do not remember that he said, yet I know that he holds, that the Church of Rome is culpable for allowing reference to the Apocrypha in proof of doctrine. In other words, he is content, with the Sixth Article, "to fault" the Church of Rome, and not, with the two doctors, "to fault" his own Church.

"*Q.* 10. By Dr. Smith. 'Can there be a doubt that, in separating from the Church of Rome, the Church of England embraced more pure and scriptural views of doctrine? And is not the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, at present, more pure in doctrine than the Church of Rome?'

Ans. 'There can be a doubt, on the ground that the Church of England *retained* doctrinal errors, viz., the doctrines of Puritanism.' 'In some points, the Roman missal was preferable to our liturgy.' Upon the question put by the bishop, 'What those points were?' Mr. Carey was understood by us, to instance, among other points, 'the closer conformity to the ancient liturgies.' 'He held that, in a popular view, our liturgy was better than theirs in omitting metaphysical distinctions, and also in being in a tongue understood by the people.'"

Here again I must express my surprise that the two doctors could, by any possible hallucination, be led to fancy that a young man, who is not a dolt, could utter such nonsense as they have put into Mr. Carey's mouth. The Church of England, at the Reformation, *retain* the doctrines of Puritanism! *retain*, as from *before* the Reformation, errors which were never hatched till *after* the Reformation! Assuredly Mr. Carey said nothing of

* "Here, upon reflection, we are of opinion that a direct protest should have been interposed by us, as, in the entire course of our ministry, of nearly twenty-seven years, we have never known an instance in which this privilege was either asked or accorded."

the kind. What he did say, and what he repeated distinctly and emphatically, was, that the Church of England, after she became settled in the Reformation, was *much purer, both in doctrine and practice, than she had been before.*

The next words which the "Statement" puts in Mr. Carey's mouth are, "In some points the Roman Missal was preferable to our Liturgy." An odd comparison, truly, (if, as is doubtless the case, the "Statement" means by "our Liturgy" the Book of Common Prayer,) and one which Mr. Carey never made. It was the "Roman Breviary" which he said he thought preferable in some respects to our Liturgy; and the reasons which he assigned for the preference were, that the Breviary contained more copious citations from Scripture, and a richer variety of services. "He held," says the "Statement," "that in a popular view our Liturgy was better than theirs in omitting metaphysical distinctions." "Metaphysical distinctions" in a Liturgy! Was ever such crucifixion of a sensible man's meaning? Mr. Carey's words were, that for the purposes of congregational worship our Liturgy was better than theirs, *in avoiding all that might give occasion to idolatry*, and also in being in a tongue understood by the people.

"The greater conformity to the ancient Liturgies" was referred by Mr. Carey, neither to the Breviary nor to the present Roman Missal, (which would have been strangely absurd) but to the Canon of the Mass; and here the parallel was run by Mr. Carey, not between it and the communion service of our Church, but between it and the communion service of the Church of England; which, as is confessed by the best Anglican divines, is defective, and was pronounced (as Bishop White informs us) by the first bishop of our American Church, to be essentially defective. Mr. Carey said that the Roman Canon of the Mass was preferable to the Communion Service of the Church of England, and in closer conformity with the ancient Liturgies; all of which have, what the Communion Service of the Church of England wants, "The Oblation" and "The Invocation."

I do not remember that a word was said of the Roman Missal, and I know that if the comparison had been instituted between the Communion Service in our Prayer-book and the present Roman Missal, Mr. Carey would most fully and unequivocally have declared his preference for the former, and have condemned the interpolations, additions, and corruptions, with which the modern Romanists have encrusted and defiled their ancient Canon. By the by, it may be worth mentioning, that on subsequent inquiry of Mr. Carey, I have learned from him that he never read the Roman Missal, and knows nothing more of it than is to be gathered from Brett's translation and Palmer's notes.

"*Q.* 11. 'What construction do you put upon the promise of conformity to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church?'

Ans. 'He did not consider (as we understood Mr. Carey to say) the articles as binding our consciences in points of faith,' and read a passage from 'White's Memoirs of the Church,' (Convention of 1801,) which he considered as maintaining the same opinion.

'He does not feel himself obliged to give his *ex animo* assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, as the assent is given in the English Church.'

"As we understood Mr. Carey to say." The reader is by this time prepared to suspect that Mr. Carey's words could hardly pass through the understanding of the two doctors without being changed from white to black. The Articles not binding on the conscience in points of faith! Why these are exactly the points on which the Articles are binding on the consciences, both of laity and clergy, under pain of damnation. Mr. Carey most assuredly said no such thing; nor can I imagine the reason of this absurd statement, (supposing there were a reason,) except it be that the two doctors, in the event of failing to make Mr. Carey a Papist, were determined to make him a Pagan.

What Mr. Carey did say was, that in points *not* of faith, he did not consider the Articles to be binding on the conscience under pain of damnation. In other words, in regard to the controverted points between us and Rome, Mr. Carey did not consider that our Church imposes the *negative*, as the Roman Church does the *affirmative* on the conscience under penalty of damnation. This error, which Mr. Carey persisted in disclaiming in spite of the efforts of the two doctors to extort from him a confession of it, is one which the Romanists constantly impute to us, as knowing that it would be a death-blow to our existence as a branch of the Christian Church; and as Mr. Carey referred to many divines of the Church of England, and especially to Bishop Bull, in support of his view, I will here quote from the latter the passage to which Mr. Carey referred, and which he afterwards pointed out to me in Bishop Bull's Works, vol. 2, p. 211, of the Clarendon edition:

"As for our being concluded by the Articles of our Church, if he means [the bishop is here arguing against a Papist] our being obliged to give our internal assent to every thing delivered in them upon peril of damnation, it is confessed that few, yea, none of us, that are well advised, will acknowledge ourselves so concluded by them, nor did our Church ever intend we should. For she professeth not to deliver all her Articles (all, I say, for some of them are coincident with the fundamental points of Christianity) as essentials of faith, without the belief whereof no man can be saved; *but only propounds them as a body of safe and pious principles, for the preservation of peace, to be subscribed and not openly contradicted by her sons.*"

"And read a passage from 'White's Memoirs,' * * which he considered as maintaining the same opinion." Which *he considered!* Why Mr. Carey referred to a matter of fact, to the known laws of the two Churches of England and our own, about which there is and can be no difference of opinion. Bishop White, in the passage referred to, states the fact, that in the English Church a distinct and *ex animo* subscription to the Articles is required, while in our Church there is required only a general promise of "conformity to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

Then comes the categorical answer which, in reference to the impression which it conveys to the public mind, is unfair to a degree only short of falsehood. Mr. Carey said in effect: "Gentlemen, I am ready to subscribe to the Articles *ex animo*, as is done in the English Church; but I must say, that if I were disposed to stand on my rights, this is more than you could require of me; for it is more than our Church requires. Our Church requires of me only a general promise of conformity to all her doctrines, without obliging me to profess a separate and *ex amino* assent to her Articles. Such is the law of our Church, and such my right under her law; but I am perfectly willing to waive this right, and to give my *ex animo* assent to the Thirty-nine Articles as the assent is given in the English Church."

"Previous to our putting to Mr. Carey our twelfth question, the following questions were put by us to him:

Q. 1. 'Can you subscribe to the 22d Article?'

Ans. 'I could subscribe to it, considering it as referring to the popular doctrine of the Romish Church.'"

The fair answer of Mr. Carey to this question as gathered from all that he said in the course of a protracted examination, was, I think, this: 1. That there is an historical difficulty in the way of making the twenty-second Article refer to the Decrees of Trent, viz., that the Decrees of Trent to which the Article is supposed to refer, were not promulgated until *after* the Articles were set forth. But, 2. That if the twenty-second Article were held to refer to the Decrees of Trent, he must understand it to refer to the Decrees not as taken in the mere letter, and as they appear to an ingenuous Protestant, anxiously desirous to approximate them to Catholic verities, but as they appear when taken in connexion with the popular system of the Church of Rome, with the current teaching of her doctors, and with the corruptions and abuses which that Church upholds. This, I repeat, is the impression, which, I think, a candid and intelligent mind would have derived from Mr. Carey's examination; and it is the opinion which I know that he holds.

"It was here objected to the candidate by Dr. Smith, that the change made in the article disproved the idea of its referring to the popular doctrine. As the article stood in the reign of Edward VI., it was styled 'the doctrine of the schoolmen;' but after its endorsement by the Council of Trent, it was styled the '*Romish doctrine.*'"

I quote this passage merely to express in passing, my thanks to Professor Wilson, who so ably, and to the universal satisfaction of the Church, fills the chair of Systematic Theology, for having directed the attention of his class to the fact which the passage brings to view, in the presence of the Rev. Dr. Smith and myself, a day or two before the examination of Mr. Carey. Whether Dr. Smith, as well as myself, is obliged to the professor for a piece of information which contrasts so favorably with the rest of the "Statement," is more than I know.

"Touching the doctrine of the invocation of saints, mentioned in this article, the question was asked by Dr. Smith 'whether that doctrine had any warrant in Scripture?' He replied that 'it had not.' The question was farther put by Dr. S., 'whether it were right to introduce or observe the practice without any warranty from Scripture;' to which it was replied 'that it was not forbidden.' The examination was farther prosecuted by the bishop, when the candidate, in reply to a question touching the lawfulness of the practice, was understood to say that 'he did not fault the Church of Rome, provided the invocation was confined to the '*ora pro nobis*,' or intercessory form.'"

The impression conveyed by this passage to the reader doubtless is, that Mr. Carey thought that the Invocation of Saints, though unwarranted by Scripture, might yet be safely introduced and observed in the services of the Church. Mr. Carey's examination gave no countenance to such an impression. The words "it was not forbidden" referred by the two doctors to the *practice*, was referred by Mr. Carey to the *doctrine* of Invocation. Now a doctrine, neither warranted nor forbidden by Scripture, may be innocently held by individuals, while the practice which may be grafted on it is felt to be dangerous to individuals, and utterly unfit to be incorporated into a Liturgy. This is just Mr. Carey's view in regard to the Invocation of Saints; and as I am writing not only to correct the misrepresentations of the two doctors, but also to counteract the impression which they have conveyed to the public, I may be here allowed to repeat the statement lately made in the Churchman, that Mr. C. has never practised nor felt a desire to practise the Invocation of Saints; that his views on this subject are the same as those which I lately made the basis of a review of Dr. Charles Constantine Pise's book, and that no man has expresssd to me his approbation of that review with more gust than Mr. Carey.

It is true that Mr. Carey said that he did not fault the Church of Rome, provided the Invocation was confined to the '*ora pro nobis*,' or intercessory form; but what of this, when the Church of Rome, in her Breviary, her Pontifical and her Missal, carries the Invocati n far beyond this form? But enough on this head.

"*Q.* 2. 'How do you understand the last clause of the 19th article, viz., "As the Church of Hierusalem, &c., have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith?" The answer was substantially this: 'I understand the article in an historical sense—as referring to the *past*, and not to the *present* state of the Church of Rome.' The last section of the article he considered 'as directed against the abiding infallibility of the Church of Rome, as a particular branch of the Church universal.'"

Mr. Carey here referred the two doctors to Palmer's Treatise on the Church, expressing his regret, if I remember right, that the book was not at hand. The following is the passage of the able antagonist of Dr. Wiseman, to which Mr. Carey referred:—"The article only affirms that the Roman Church *has erred* in matters of faith, e. g., in the case of Liberius and Honorius, there is no assertion that it *does* now err in faith. The object is to deny the infallibility of the particular Church of Rome."

Now Mr. Palmer is, perhaps, the most able and determined opponent of the Church of Rome now living; and yet he here assumes, as a thing not to be denied, that there is no difference in faith between the Churches of England and Rome. Such is the constant language of the best systematic divines of the Anglican Church, from the Reformation downwards.

"The question was then pressed in another form, viz.: 'Do you consider the Church of Rome *now* to be in error in matters of faith?'

Dr. Seabury here repeatedly objected to the candidate's answering, and he accordingly declined answering. The question, however, being pressed, and the bishop deciding that it must be answered, the final reply was in the following words, taken down by Dr. Anthon:

Ans. 'It is a difficult question, which I do not know how to answer; but I refer to my answer on the other question, touching my opinion of the decrees of the Council of Trent.'"

My objections were not made to the *question*, nor was there any dispute in the committee, or decision of the Bishop, as far as I remember, about the question being put. The nature of my objections, and of Mr. Carey's difficulty, will appear from a brief statement of the facts. The two doctors desired a categorical answer to the question, "Is or is not the Church of Rome now in error in matters of faith?" Mr. Carey replied, that there was no difference between the two churches in faith; and directly as Dr. Anthon took his pen to reduce the answer to writing, I arose to express my sense of the unfairness of the procedure: that when Mr. Carey, taking the word *faith* in the theological sense, declared what was most undoubtedly true, the two doctors, by means of their minutes, should thus be able to make Mr. Carey appear responsible for a declaration which, the word faith being taken in the popular sense, was utterly false, and did not convey his meaning at all. And as Dr. Anthon's previous admonition to the bishop, as well as to myself, foreclosed all opportunity of mutual explanation with him; and as an explanation, if begun with Dr. Smith, might have been pending still; I had no other resource, than either to renew my objections to their extraordinary proceeding of taking minutes, or to propound such questions to the candidate, as might serve to elicit his meaning to the comprehension of the two doctors. I did both; and my questions drew from Mr. Carey the distinct avowal, that by the word *faith* he meant *fundamentals*, and not Christian doctrine in general. This the two doctors thought was prompting Mr. Carey, and suggesting to him his answers; and accordingly, without heeding the explanations which I drew from Mr. Carey, they continued to press him to a categorical answer. Now, if Mr. C. had, with Palmer and our best systematic divines, answered the question in the negative, i. e., that there was no difference *in faith* between the Church and the Romanists, he would have given the two doctors, (as it seems he has given them, and through them the public,) the impression that he was a downright papist; and on the other hand, if he answered in the affirmative, viz., that the Church of Rome is in error *in faith*, i. e., in fundamentals, he would have done violence to his own sense, and contradicted the ablest divines of our Church from the Reformation downward. Thus pressed, Mr. Carey, after various evolutions, meekly replied, "Gentlemen, it is a difficult question, which I do not know how to answer!"

I come now to Pope Pius' creed. At page 23 of the "Statement," Mr. Carey is made to answer that he receives the articles of the Creed of Pius IV., so far as they are repetitions of the decrees of the Council of Trent." This is repeated p. 27; and p. 38 it grows to be "a distinct avowal of the conjoint reception of the decrees of Trent, the Creed of Pius IV., and," &c. Again, p. 42, the question is said to be, "Will Churchmen be content that even they who are to minister to them in holy things, shall come to them with a double creed—with the Thirty-nine articles and the Creed of Pius IV., with the Prayer-Book and the Missal?" And that exactly the right, i. e., the blackest impression, might be made on the public mind, the Creed of Pius IV. is published at the end of the pamphlet, to certify to the world, what? why that Mr. Carey is a villain; a villain of the basest dye.

That men who do not distinguish between Articles of Faith and Articles of Religion; who think a man a Papist for calling the Apocrypha Holy Scripture; who can confound the Breviary and the Missal; who can talk about the errors of Puritanism being retained in the Church from before the Reformation, and who can gravely ask, whether the Saints in Paradise can be benefited by the administration of the Holy Communion on earth; that such men may, without intentional guilt, avouch to the world that Mr. Carey has made "a distinct avowal of the * * reception of * * * the creed of Pius IV.," is what I can understand; but that such an act, whatever were its motives, will be suffered to pass without punishment by some law, either civil or ecclesiastical, is what I shall be slow to believe.

The question was put "Do you, or do you not, receive the articles of the creed of Pius IV?" In justice to himself, and in perfect truth, ay, and with the most exact expression of truth, Mr. Carey might have answered to this insidious question, No; not a solitary one of them! For what is a creed? It is a summary of those articles of Faith which are necessary to salvation; to be received under peril of damnation; and to be held as bound on the conscience by the awful words, "He that believeth not shall be damned!" Mr. Carey had again and again declared that in receiving the decrees of Trent in that mild construction of them by which, good men have sought to approximate them to Catholic verities, *he rejected the damnatory clauses.* How could he then receive the matters embraced in these decrees as "Articles of a Creed?" For no good purpose, I fear, was the question pressed; nevertheless it was pressed. Now if Mr. Carey had answered in the negative, and declared that he did not receive one of the Articles of Pope Pius' Creed, he would have said indeed the truth, but he would have used words which he knew would be understood by the two doctors in a different sense from that which he intended to convey. Thus pressed he gave an answer, the ingenuousness of which I respect, whatever I may think of the use which has been made of it.

There is, I think, a wide difference between receiving the Articles of Pope Pius' creed, considered *as* repetitions of Tridentine decrees, and receiving the Tridentine decrees considered *as* articles of Pope Pius' Creed. In the one case a man may hold them to-day and reject them to-morrow; may hold them as speculations of the closet, without favoring the practice that is grafted on them: in the other case he must hold them irrevocably, and adopt the practical corruptions which the Church of Rome grafts upon them. And to see this yet more plainly, the reader has only to consider the phraseology of the Creed: "I promise, vow, and swear most constantly to retain and profess, &c." How different from Mr. Carey's language, "I do not deny them, but I would not positively affirm them!"

Before Mr. Carey is condemned for this declaration, it might be as well for his censors to reflect how far they are in the same predicament. I believe that there are many of these decrees which even those Churchmen who are Calvinistic in their tendencies, and low in their Churchmanship, would readily assent to, and which might sadly cross the views of some old Arminians; and many more which those, who like the two doctors, desire to be thought "Bishop Hobart men," would readily assent to, which would equally cross their Low Church brethren. For instance there are few Low Churchmen who would not agree with me in the following, the damnatory clause excepted.

"[If any one asserts] that he [Adam] being stained with the sin of disobedience, transmitted death and corporal penalties only, upon all the human race, and not also sin, which is the death of the soul, let him be accursed."

Now this decree is contained in Pope Pius' Creed; but do the Low Churchmen receive it *as* an article of that creed? If so, they would excommunicate and anathematize the venerable Bishop White, and many others (if alive) who have expressly denied the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity.

Again, such "Bishop Hobart men" as the two doctors, must agree with the Council in the following decrees, the damnatory clauses excepted:

"If any shall say, that all Christians have power to minister the word, and all the sacraments; let him be accursed."

"If any shall say that real and natural water is not necessary in Baptism; and so shall pervert the words of our Lord Christ, 'Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost,' into some metaphor; let him be accursed."

"If any shall say, that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy, appointed by Divine Ordination, which consists of Bishops, presbyters, and ministers; let him be accursed."

These decrees, too, are contained in the creed of Pius IV; but do the two doctors, therefore, receive them *as* articles of that creed? If so, then they are bound to refuse communion with their Low Church brethren, and either turn them out of our Church, or go over themselves to Rome.

I might proceed to quote a large number of the decrees of Trent to which no good Churchman would except; all which are contained in Pope Pius' creed, but none of which any Churchman could accept *as* contained in that creed. I beg the reader, therefore, to observe that Romanism does not consist in receiving the decrees of Trent, but in receiving them as binding on the conscience, under pain of damnation, so as not to hold religious communion with those who deny them. The two doctors give great prominence to the fact that Mr. Carey received the decrees of Trent, and slur over, as if a matter of little or no moment, the fact that he rejects the damnatory clauses. But this is the very *essence* of Romanism; for it is by the admission of these clauses that a man *is*, and by the denial of them that a man is *not* a Romanist. Romanism without its anathemas! The creed of Pius IV without its damnatory clauses! Why they may as well talk of vinegar without its sourness, or gall without its bitterness; it being the very essence of Romanism not to receive few, or many, or all of the Tridentine decrees, but to receive and bind them on the conscience as part of that essential faith without which no man can be saved.

This is the distinction and it seems to me the distinctive glory of our Church, that she binds only the fundamental faith on the consciences of her members, leaving them free on all subordinate matters; this is the solution of that perpetual enigma to her enemies, *viz.*, that she is subject to occasional excitements and controversies, without danger of division or schism. This feature it mainly is, which is to secure the triumph of the Church in these United States; and heaven forefend the day when either High Churchmen or Low Churchmen should cherish the wish to bind their distinctive tenets on the conscience, as part of the faith of Christ. If any men on either side drive at this, *they* are either sectarians or Romanists; and it is to be hoped that such (if such there be) will speedily leave the Church and join either the sectaries or Rome.

For this reason I say, that even if it were true—as it is not—that Mr. Carey receives the matter contained in Pope Pius' Creed, it would still be false, most injuriously false, to represent him as receiving that creed.

An unexpected letter from a learned friend, furnishes here another point:

"*My Dear Dr.*—On Saturday "The True Issue" made its appearance in this quarter, and I have finished reading it this morning. In page 23, Mr. Carey is made to answer that he receives "The Articles of the Creed of Pius IV., so far as they are repetitions of the Decrees of the Council of Trent." This is repeated in a more aggravated form, p. 27. And in p. 38, it is called "A distinct avowal of the conjoint reception of the Decrees of Trent, the Creed of Pius IV., and our own Standards." Again, in p. 42, the question is said to be: "Will Churchmen be content, that even they who are to minister to them in holy things, shall come to them with a double creed—with the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Creed of Pius IV., with the Prayer Book and Missal?"

Now I cannot believe, with my present information, that this is a fair statement of Mr. Carey's admissions. The Creed of Pope Pius IV, is to be received according to the Animus Imponentis. The Church which that creed means, is not the Catholic Church as we view it, but the Catholic Church as that Council viewed it, viz: the Roman Schism. Consequently to receive the Creed of Pius IV., is in fact entire conformity to the Church of Rome. That creed pronounces that Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege, yet it is a notorious fact, that the Church of Rome constantly commits this sacrilege, if the Orders of the Anglican Church be valid. It is not to be supposed that a young man so excellent in every respect as Mr. Carey, so scrupulous about right and wrong, and so well informed as to all the points of controversy, could or would have presented himself for Deacons' Orders in our Church, for the very purpose of being guilty of sacrilege. For, whatever may be said on the part of the Church of Rome, the guilt of sacrilege must remain on the conscience of the individual who could wilfully and knowingly receive orders in our Church, when he had doubts as to our Orders or jurisdiction. I cannot conceive of any motive which could lead Mr. Carey to receive Orders in our Church under such circumstances. He is not one who would trifle with sacred things. I conclude, therefore, that the pamphlet does not contain a true statement of facts.

I am glad to perceive by the declaration of Dr. Berrian and others, that no counter statement will be published by them, and that in justice to Mr. Carey, they deny the correctness of the answers as exhibited in the pamphlet."

But supposing the statement of the two doctors to be so softened down as to express the fact of Mr. Carey's reception of that creed, apart from its character as a creed; I affirm that even this is extremely false. I do not impute intentional falsehood to the two doctors; for they have doubtless written on the supposition that the Creed of Pius IV, contained nothing more than the Decrees of Trent, the error of which supposition, I will briefly show.

1. The Creed of Pius IV., contains a promise of true obedience to the Bishop of Rome as Vicar of Jesus Christ; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

2. The Creed of Pius IV., contains a confession that the *Roman* Church is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

3. The Creed of Pius IV., obliges its recipient to take the Holy Scriptures in that sense which the *Roman* Church puts on them, and to regard the *Romad* Church as the judge of controversies; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

4. The Creed of Pope Pius obliges its recipient steadfastly to admit and embrace all the traditions and observances of the *Roman* Church; of which there is not a word in the Decrees of Trent.

5. The Creed of Pope Pius obliges its recipient to receive and admit the approved ceremonies of the *Roman* Church in the administration of the sacraments; of which there is not a word in the Council of Trent.

6. The Creed of Pius IV. (compare Council of Florence, Sess. xxv.) requires its professor to hold that the faithful, after death, are liable to poenal suffering, and that from this state of suffering they may be released by the sacrifices of masses; of which there is not a word in the Council of Trent.

7. The Creed of Pius IV. (compared with the second Council of Nice, and fourth of Constantinople) requires its professor to honorably worship the images of our Lord, of the Virgin and other saints, also the forms and representations of angels; the Council of Trent, on the other hand, accords to them only "*due* honor and veneration," which no man, I suppose will refuse.

8. The Creed of Pius IV. (compared with the second Council of Nice) requires its professor to believe that frankincense and lights should be presented to images, to the figure of the cross, to the holy gospels, and to the other sacred instruments of the Church; of which there is not a word in the Council of Trent.

9. The Creed of Pius IV. (compared with the third of Lateran) requires its professor to believe that an oath is not binding in opposition to the decree of said Council; for that "those are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are contrary to the good of the Church, and the appointments of the Holy Fathers; of all which there is nothing in the Council of Trent.

10. The Creed of Pius IV. (compared with the 4th of Lateran) requires its professor to acknowledge the right of the Pope to absolve subjects from their allegiance to a temporal lord; and to believe that heretics and the abettors of heresy are incapable of making a will or of succeeding to an inheritance; evacuates the judicial sentences of heretical judges; forbids the pleading of an advocate for an heretical client; and requires the instruments drawn up by a notary for such client to be deemed invalid, and "to be condemned with their damned author;" of which there is nothing in the Decrees of Trent.

11. The Creed of Pius IV. (compared with the 5th of Lateran) forbids its professor to print, or cause to be printed, any book, or any writing whatsoever, unless they be first accurately examined by the bishop (or one deputed by him for the purpose) of the state or diocese in which he resides, under pain of a pecuniary mulct and excommunication; of which there is nothing in the Council of Trent.

The two first of these differences are expressed in Pope Pius' Creed; and that the others are contained in it, will be denied only by a papist.

In short, the Creed of Pius IV., in that clause which requires its professor "undoubtedly to receive and profess all other things delivered, defined and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils," binds his conscience with so many matters not contained in the Decrees of Trent, that if the two doctors had kept back their "True Issue" until the number was determined, they would have deprived their publishers forever of a very snug speculation.

Now these, I apprehend, are such differences as utterly falsify the declaration twice expressly made in the "Statement," that Mr. Carey avowed his reception of Pope Pius' Creed; an avowal which Mr. Carey never made, and never dreamed of making; but which the two doctors have *inferred* from what he said about the Decrees of Trent. I do not impute deception to the two doctors, but I blame them, and I trust that on reflection they will blame themselves, for the precipitancy with which they have published their libel to the world.

To the Editor of the Churchman.

"July 26th.

"Rev'd Sir,—Allow me to make one single remark on page 7, line 7, of the 'Statement:' 'He very frankly admitted them, one only excepted,' &c. These words have reference to my private examination by Dr. Smith, on his having mentioned to me certain sayings, which he had heard attributed to me.

"Even now that the doctor has thought fit to *publish* his minute of my private interview with him, (nay, to publish as well the copy which I did *not* correct, as the one which I did,) I cannot bring myself to say more than I said when he put my conversation in *writing;* "I should not have done so towards him." (Statement, page 11.) I shall therefore confine myself simply to a comment on the words which I have pointed out above, premising that even this I make, with no desire to impute intentional unfairness to the doctor, but merely because, as he and I were alone at the time, *none can speak on the subject, except himself and me.* It will show, however, how differently the same thing may appear, when viewed from different points.

"The doctor had heard several expressions attributed to me, and on them he based his first examination. One I expressly denied, as morally impossible. The others I said I might have used, *because, in a certain modified sense, I was willing to defend them. The modification (which is all omitted in the document) was therefore absolutely necessary, to get at my meaning.* I did not distinctly recollect making such remarks, but said, I never could have made them, except in such and such a sense. I did not volunteer the strong language which the doctor drew out of me in confidence, as that which I should prefer, or naturally adopt, but as language which could be justified by explanation. I do not see how I could have done otherwise, when an examination was based, not on our standards, but on previous rumors.

"When on our second meeting, the doctor took me through the Articles, he did not perceive any hesitation in my answers; nor did I gather that he objected at all to my view of the whole subject of justification, merit, works before and after justification, works of supererogation, and sin after baptism, the topics which were principally handled between us. I might add, by the way, that the point of the *Papal Supremacy never came up*, though had it done so, I could easily have shown him my difference from the Church of Rome in that important particular. 'Frank' I certainly was in my statements, as I had entire confidence in the Rector of St. Peter's, but that frankness did not lead me to make, *de novo*, the obnoxious statements, but only to show in what manner I thought them defensible.

Yours respectfully,

Arthur Carey.